

N. J. NANPORIA

*WHAT PRICE
NEW ORDER?*

BOMBAY
THACKER & Co., LTD.
1943

Copyright Reserved

*Set and printed in India by
R. Bourdon at Western Printers & Publishers' Press,
15-23, Hamam Street, Fort, Bombay,
and Published by C. Murphy, Manager,
Hacker & Co., Ltd., Rampart Row, Bombay.*

CONTENTS

PREFACE	7
-------------------	---

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF FREEDOM	11
---------------------------------	----

CHAPTER TWO

CONSEQUENCES OF DEMOCRATIC FAILURE	31
--	----

CHAPTER THREE

INTERNATIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM	49
---	----

CHAPTER FOUR

DECAY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF	74
-------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER FIVE

CONSEQUENCES OF RELIGIOUS DECAY	94
---	----

CHAPTER SIX

OUR WAR AIMS	117
------------------------	-----

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIALISM AND THE NEW DEMOCRATIC ORDER	136
--	-----

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE SOCIALIST'S TASKS	181
---------------------------------	-----

PREFACE

'There are two forces in the world: the force of the sword and the force of an idea, and the latter always wins.'

Napoleon.

Superficially, though quite correctly, the present war may be interpreted as a war of imperialism, a war arising from the inevitable clash of interests engendered by the increasing tempo of competing capitalist monopolies. Such an interpretation has been fully developed in the later sections of the book, but we need to mention it here only as a contradistinction to the more significant and fundamentally genuine interpretation of the war as a war of ideas. It must be emphasised however that while the war is a war of imperialism, and as such is not dissimilar to previous wars, in the interests of future peace and common prosperity, the war against the Nazi-fascists should be interpreted as a war of ideas. There appears to be a confusion however as to what the conflicting ideas are, and this is a field of the war which the popular imaginative intelligence has failed so far to penetrate. It is, I believe, quite the fashion to interpret the war as a war of ideas, and though such an interpretation is as yet not as extensive as we could have wished, it is now generally accepted that there are finer subtleties than gross territorial expansion involved in this war. The exigencies of war no doubt, and in the interests of propaganda morale, the conception has been cultivated that the conflicting ideas that are inherent in the war are those of Nazi-fascism and democracy, representative of two distinct ways of living. A careful and analytical scrutiny of this statement however, reveals

that it may more pertinently be expressed in the assertion that imperialism manifesting itself in the form of Nazi-fascism has clashed with an imperialism manifesting itself in a democratic form of government. In the final analysis it is a repetitive interpretation of the war as a war of imperialism.

What then, are precisely the ideas involved? An extensive and exhaustive survey of the issues thus introduced is impossible within the limits imposed by considerations of space and war-time economy, but if the simulacrum of the interacting forces which have evoked the war has been achieved in the following pages, our major purpose will have been fulfilled.

The first sections are devoted to a survey of economic, cultural and political forces which have evolved those conditions favourable to the emergence of Hitlerism and war. Subsequently, passing on to a consideration of a constructive programme we develop the conception of a socialist-democracy the *raison d'être* of which is the establishment of such conditions as will conduce to the full life of democracy and personality.

The whole book is a plea for a greater tolerance, a nobler catholicity in our outlook upon the war. A picture is attempted of the various forces which went to the making of the catastrophe in which we are embroiled today, and of how these very forces may either be abolished or harnessed to the cause of a socialist-democracy. This book makes no pretensions to apparent unity. Philosophy, politics, religion, the New Order, psychology, education, sociology—all these and innumerable more are woven into

a pattern—a quilt perhaps of monstrous design and doubtful purpose. Yet if the patient reader would but contemplate this pattern, seemingly irrational and idiotic as it might appear, he would perchance perceive the grand harmony that is in this very chaos which surrounds us on every side. It is a harmony of unending relationships. In the ultimate analysis there is nothing under the sun which has not in its own degree contributed toward the condition in which the world is today. So the quilt of many colours and many fantasies hangs together...

In implication this book is a vigorous denunciation of the puerile and absurd practice of laying war guilt at the door of a single nation or a single man. It is concerned with forces and patterns—patterns that evoke Fascism and war, and patterns that evoke a progressive socialist-democracy. Its purpose is served if it suggests to a few readers new, creative lines of thought by which they as individuals may work towards the reconstruction of this chaotic and sorry world.

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF FREEDOM

WE are all familiar with the gibe so often used to deride the philosopher, that he is like a blind man searching in a dark room for a black cat that isn't there, and no less well acquainted with the retort of the philosopher to the theologian that the latter would succeed in tracking down the elusive feline. In beginning this study of the war with an analysis of the nature of freedom, I clearly commit myself to a task which like the philosopher's futility invites similar gibes and ridicule. That, perhaps, is inevitable in an age of superficiality and shallow thinking. The cult of simplicity has never before been so pronounced and dominant, and never before has it been abused as it is at the present time. War, it is obvious, is a social malaise in a magnified and concrete form, and any social study must needs be complex and therefore irreconcilable with the tenets of simplicity. This being so, there is a tendency, to reduce this war to simple fundamentals—such as the disarming analysis which decrees that the Nazis represent Evil and we virgin Good. Our propagandists appear to be satisfied with this fantastic formula, and presumably find it adequate for their fatuous requirements. With the exception of an intellectual minority therefore, the war still

remains a matter of struggle between Good and Evil, a matter which like all the other wars that have gone before has neither significance nor meaning beyond territorial and material avarice. To suggest that the struggle—the vast upheaval which mankind is undergoing today—is a more complicated problem with far-reaching and manifold consequences, affecting the whole species of mankind, is to invite the calumny that we are seeking the elusive feline in the darkened room. So be it.

The fact that this latest of wars is a more virulent and violent intensification of all the horrors and tribulations customarily associated with wars, has fortunately aroused the masses to the sudden though yet faint realisation that our struggle against Nazi-Fascism has materialised in the form of a climax to all the internecine frictions and national wars that preceded it. And in that it is a climax, it is fraught with menace for humankind; during the period of the anticlimax, will humankind be courageous enough, prepared enough, determined enough to save itself from the oblivion and barbaric eclipse that threatens its existence? The masses together are more intelligent today than they have ever been; this is a natural corollary to the scientific progress of the last century or so. And it is precisely this intelligence, yet in its incipency, raw and undeveloped among the world's conscious millions, that constitutes the only hope for humankind. An appeal must be directed to this core of common intelligence, for only by so doing can this war be placed in the right perspective; our propagandists however are idiotically refusing to recognise this condition of certain victory. They continue, with all the

nauseating insistence of asinine stupidity, to direct appeals to the emotions, arousing nationalistic fervours and national hatreds, absolutely inimical to the proper conduct of the war and the reconstruction of the post-war world such as would create peace and nullify conditions making for war. Already, be it noted, there is a universal awakening of the spirit and intellect, in the form of queries often unconscious and inexpressed as to what precisely this war means and can mean for humankind.

It is for all socialists and intellectual leaders to exploit this advantage, guide public opinion to the true and inclusive realisation of what this war is about. Foreign offices have given us, graciously enough, several versions of their conception of what this struggle means. We need not trouble to go into them here; suffice is it to point out that they are *par excellence* fruits of the twentieth century cult of puerile simplicity. They shun complexity, probably because to Foreign Offices the complex truth is slightly embarrassing. Governments have invoked the clergy to call upon an anthropomorphic God to despatch fire and brimstone upon the heads of our barbaric enemies; they have represented the latter as the devil incarnate, and our propaganda consists solely of a monotonous recital of what the bad, bad, so *bad*, enemy has been doing to innocent little we.

For one reason or another Governments have failed to educate the public into the realities of this war. The masses, as always have been kept in the dark, and what little the proletariat suspect and understand of the war, they owe solely to the common

and widespread revival of intelligence of which we have spoken. It will not normally be long before the whole Truth is grasped, but the times slip past with bewildering rapidity, and the climax of the war is bearing down upon us, so that unless public opinion is enlightened and by their support and spirit thus evoked, a tremendous effort is not made to reconstruct again in the spirit of untiring and unflagging idealism, the human race will relapse into a barbaric retrogression horrible beyond contemplation.....The histories of the Universe will bear witness to the fact that the awakening of the human race was too late for the pressing requirements of evolutionary process.

The burden of responsibility lying upon intellectuals and social leaders is therefore tremendous, and it is a moot point whether they are, even at this crucial moment, wholly cognisant of the fact of this responsibility and duty toward mankind. It is their leadership that the world requires even if unconscious of this, the world do not cry out for it. Already the pessimistic minded, with some justification, have declared that in the absence of any signs of a virile intellectual leadership, the case for humankind is hopeless and beyond revivification. But however dark and bleak the outlook for our species there is constantly the hope that intelligence and common sense will prevail against stupidity (not be it noted evil).

* * *

Prior to any positive constructive suggestions which will be advanced later, the war as such must be placed in the right perspective and explained in terms understandable to the intelligence of the man in the street, for as I have stressed the salvation of mankind more

than ever before is dependent upon the mental powers of the common man in the street. In so far as he is capable of understanding the magnitude of the issues to that extent is the future of the human race vouchsafed. Philosophers and social students have caught glimpses of the Truth underlying this greatest struggle of mankind, but of no avail; they are classified in a minority, and it is the amiable but generally stupid majority capable of expending spirit and strength to a cause which it understands as righteous that must be won over to the side of intelligent understanding.

The first necessity which is a correct understanding of the war, involves an analysis of the nature of freedom. I hesitate in using this much-abused word, for it has been bandied about with all the careless abandon of hypocritical politicians and no less reprehensible yellow journalists. The name of freedom has been invoked to justify the dastardly machinations of war-mongers and vile politicians; it has been used without scruple to sanctify acts of selfishness detrimental to all but sectional and vested interests. Freedom has been and is the hand-maiden of all parties conceivable. Only the Nazis, in contradistinction to the Japanese, have, as is understandable in a peoples in despair, openly denounced freedom and deride it as a contemptible characteristic of western democracy, indicative of moral senility. Those countries which have aspired to democracy, namely, Britain, the United States of America and France, have all nurtured the ideal of freedom, and as *our political leaders* reiterate from time to time, freedom is one of the idealistic yet practical aims to the pursuit of which the United Nations have dedicated themselves in this war against

the Nazi-Fascists. Two other ideals are fraternity and equality which are inextricably bound up in any consideration of freedom proper.

The struggle of war may be regarded as the endeavour of humankind to fight the stupidity which it has itself engendered it is a struggle against conditions which it has itself brought about foolishly and unwittingly. It is above a struggle which as part of the evolutionary process, is an endeavour to seek light and understanding and better mode of life. We are all unconsciously seeking the better life of which we know we shall be capable one day, but in this conscious and unconscious striving for the ultimate good, we are preys to all the temptations and weaknesses which afflict human nature. Hence war and retrogressions. This time the danger of absolute retrogression is great, and if we do fail to survive this struggle to safety, evolutionary process will continue—toward barbarism. Evolution there always will be, but not necessarily toward the better life. It is for man to contrive to direct the evolutionary force toward the better life which he has in mind as mankind's ultimate goal.

Freedom and equality and fraternity have often been subjected to ridicule as being too idealistic; the Nazis especially have been guilty of this jeering derision, because they are eminently men in despair, men who with Nordic thoroughness abandoned their belief and trust in the decency of humankind and in mankind's ability in the future of realising these ideals. And the Nazis, be it noted, are right. Right not in their jeering derision, but right in their claim that liberty, equality and fraternity are too idealistic. That is precisely so.

These three ideals together with the inclusive ideal of democracy are vital, precious, rare things, impossible of realisation until and unless mankind prepares and perfects itself for them. Democracy is neither so cheap nor easily attainable as totalitarianism or dictatorship. If it were then this war which is specifically being fought for democracy and for democratic ideals is too big and costly a price in flesh and blood and suffering. Where we have erred and err grievously is in the assumption that we had achieved our ends in the form of a democratic way of living, (when we had most certainly not), and that liberty in the purest and noblest sense of that word was a privilege enjoyed by the citizens of the western democracies. We are therefore said to fight for liberty and democracy when it may more precisely be stated that we are fighting for yet another opportunity to try democracy and freedom again. The derisive charge of idealism may be dismissed by the counter-claim that if idealism had lived among politicians and if the latter had been directed in their work by the spirit of idealism the world would have been spared much tribulation and suffering. Again, if mankind is not to strive for an ideal, what is it to strive for? Anything less than the ideal is palpably unsatisfactory. It is our manifest destiny to strive for a utopia; discontent and unhappiness will inevitably drive men to its ultimate attainment.

We are now therefore confronted with the bewildering truth that sincere though we may have been in our attempt to achieve democracy and its concomitant ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity, we have failed and in that failure and in our refusal to try again engendered a war, bloodiest and greatest of all time.

Defeat in this war means mankind deprived of the opportunity, possibly for ever, of trying democracy again. Victory means an opportunity gained to try democracy; and the victory of peace is such an opportunity wisely and fruitfully exploited. How then if liberty which is a condition of a vital and living democracy, has not been achieved, can its possession be vouchsafed by mankind ?

Liberty, as I have stressed, is idealistic, and therefore beyond the realisation of mankind until and unless the approach to it is made with care and sincerity and determination. And the approach to the ultimate ideal of liberty, paradoxical as it may be, is eminently practical and materialistic. The essential paradox is this: that to achieve genuine liberty as a condition of a vital democracy, freedom as we understand it today in the narrow sense must be abolished. We must subject ourselves to discipline, the discipline imposed by an intellectual leadership such as that I have mentioned above. The nature of this leadership and this discipline will be dealt with later, in chapters reserved for their consideration.

We may conceive of freedom (not liberty which is the precious essence itself) in relation to the state on the one part and to humankind and the world in general on the other.

FREEDOM AND THE STATE.

Ever since the nineteenth century it has been contended from Jeremy Bentham to the present leader of the House of Commons that the object of Government is solely to ensure the welfare of the subjects

governed. Upon this contention has been based the doctrine that the individual achieves genuine democratic self-realisation through and by the state which is subservient to him in that it serves his purpose. It was further established that the individual enjoyed certain rights—the rights of free speech, free religious belief, free economic and political activity and free self-government. The state, in its subservient role, maintained certain ordered conditions in which these various freedoms enjoyed by the individual could be given free reign. Milton, under the Cromwellian dictatorship, feared for the freedom of the individual. "Give me," he wrote, "above all other liberties, the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to my conscience." John Locke, Thomas Paine, the vitriolic Junius, John Stuart Mill—these thinkers and intellects have spoken and written for the freedoms of the individual; they have nobly advocated in nobler words in prose and poetry their belief in the rights of the individual. Continually there was prevalent the fear of a repressive dictatorship, repelling to the Englishman in whose blood flowed the seeds of a yearning for a liberal freedom and outlook. Politicians took the cue from literary thinkers and philosophers and commenced to mouth what are now trite platitudes about the felicities of individual freedom. As distinct from the politicians who pay lip-service to the cause of freedom, it will be noticed that from age to age it was a small circle of exclusive intellectualism that kept alive the passion for freedom, and thus enabled the nation to escape any form of dictatorial government. The state was continually being enjoined to respect the rights of the individual and to interfere in private

matters at its peril; intellectuals who with perfect justification prized their freedom above all else, cried for freedom and denounced harshly the slightest tendency on the part of the government to interfere in internal matters. Such an interference was said to constitute a violation of the rights of freedom claimed by the individual citizen; the role of the state was to maintain certain conditions which would facilitate the use of these various freedoms, and not to control or direct internal matters. Selfish intellectuals who never sought to bring their freedom to the masses, cried freedom; politicians as the tools of financiers who recognised the advantage of free trade, cried freedom and so *reductio ad absurdum*.

The situation today is identical. Then, the masses did not cry bitterly for freedom; now, they do not. With the increase of legislation and a corresponding authority vested in the government, even sectional interests and myopic intellectuals of the old school, are coming to recognise the insignificance of the freedoms existing between the individual and the state and instead realising how much greater, how much more desirable and befitting dignity of man that he should strive for the higher liberty transcending state as a condition for a democracy for all humankind. This recognition and realisation is not complete—far from it; the masses unlike the intellectuals and the governing classes have never had illusions regarding the so-called rights of the individual. They possess however an inherent conception of the nobler and more satisfying liberty that is achieved in a vital democracy, and a vague apprehension of the truth that this democracy demands a price—the price of discipline

and the initial sacrifice of individual rights and privileges and freedoms into the hands of a trusted and disciplinary body.

This body need not necessarily be dictatorial, as is almost the case in Soviet Russia where the first step towards a living democracy has been taken. It may even constitute a government comprising of members approximating to Plato's philosopher king. In considering the future of humankind on this globe after this war, if we do not postulate a disciplinary central government with the power and ability to enforce the masses to the realisation of the good life by creating such conditions as will naturally give rise to conceptions of and inclinations to the good life—if such a postulate is not permitted, there is little prospect of an early realisation of the utopia of peace and prosperity for which mankind has striven from time immemorial. The demand for freedom by traders, financiers and intellectuals, and their injunction that the state should not concern itself with the internal matters affecting private citizens, was a demand which if not inspired by purely selfish and sectional interests was based on the assumption that given freedom and recognition of their individual rights, citizens would lead the good life of democracy.

As I have stressed above, liberty is a precious, rare thing achievable only at a price which though not prohibitive, is a hard one of discipline and self-control. We see therefore that sincere as literary thinkers and philosophers were in demanding the essential rights of man, they were slightly premature in their belief that mankind in general was fit to receive the freedom

which it demanded. Considerations of the rights of man and of his individual freedom are factors with which we need not concern ourselves for the moment; they call for attention after certain conditions described in later chapters have been established. These conditions comprise the materialistic, practical and only way to the ideal of democracy.

The measure of human stupidity may be gauged by the fact that in spite of the war that has arisen from the conditions prevalent in the pre-war period, in spite of the facts clearly understandable to the meanest intelligence, people with pretension to scholarship continue to mouth platitudes regarding the evils of government legislation and government centralisation of power and control, and the proportionate decline in the 'freedom' so-called of the state's individual citizens. These intellectuals quote Milton and John Stuart Mill who penned their statements on freedom in circumstances and social conditions as alien to those prevalent today as social conditions in an African village. Whatever their reasons for continuing to advocate, against all available evidence, the traditional freedoms of the individual which cannot tolerate and regard with hostility any government intervention, it is irrefutable that the exigencies of war have brought about a closer integration between the government and the nation's peoples, leading to centralisation of power and control. Even in the midst of this war however, the conception is still current that in the post-war period, government will relinquish its newly-gained powers and privileges in favour of the old order. They conceive centralisation of power and authority as a war time improvisation which could be scrapped after the war. They do

not recognise it for what it is—a necessary evolutionary measure. They cannot or will not strive for a greater liberty beyond, the achievement of which would necessitate the sacrifice of the premature demand for the rights of individual freedom.

A disciplinary control and government of the peoples presupposes a body of men and women, sincere enough, courageous, determined and powerful enough who will concern themselves not so much with regimenting the nation's citizens as with the primary task of imposing the growth of such conditions as will in the course of time favour the production of the democratic citizen. Economic equality and prosperity, a liberal education and the employment of every pair of hands and every brain in progressive and creative work, in an atmosphere of security and peace—these conditions inevitably lead to a higher civilisation in which the individual by means of his upbringing in such conditions is unconsciously moulded into the perfect democratic citizen. Initial discipline and control are absolute necessities. We will consider the nature of this disciplinary control later; suffice is it to distinguish here the freedom that must be renounced in order to gain the liberty which is a condition of true democracy. Our fallacy lies in our confusing democratic liberty with the petty freedoms which the myopic intellectuals and selfish sectional interests demanded of the state. Freedom as such, given certain conditions is re-implanted in the form of a democratic liberty in fruition. And the state or government or body of Plato's philosopher kings as I have termed them who initially develop the nation in disciplinary control tend in the course of time to 'wither away', to use Lenin's historic phrase. The

philosopher king's task is accomplished when he has by means of his power and control imposed certain conditions—conditions which mould the growing generation of citizens into the democratic pattern. The common conception of freedom (including the rights of man demanded now) is a freedom of chaos out of which to a certain degree the present war has resulted. The consequence of this chaos will be examined later.

Here I digress to meet an objection—that the philosopher kings whom I have posited have been and are impossible conceptions. That they have been impossible hitherto is obvious, but can it on this account be declared with finality that philosopher kings are absolutely unpractical and therefore theoretical fragments of the mind impossible of achievement? The terms *philosopher* and *king* are apt to be confusing, for as used in this text they cannot be taken to imply that the nation's leader in whom the peoples vest all power and control *willingly* on the understanding that the sacrifice for the time being of their individual freedoms will subsequently be rewarded by the achievement of a democratic liberty, is both a philosopher and a king in the accepted meanings of these words. In that he is a philosopher he holds certain ideals, the ideals of democracy, freedom, equality and fraternity, of happiness, truth and common prosperity; he conceives a higher and nobler mode of life beyond the material problems with which we concern ourselves to-day. In that he is a king, his is the final authority, and his the practical power which through disciplinary control will impose those conditions favourable to the growth of this higher life. These are qualities different only in degree and not in kind from those of the statesman;

as distinguished from the lowly politician. In considering the philosopher king therefore we may more appropriately regard the statesman as approximating to that standard.

If we hold with Lord Acton that power corrupts and the more power the greater the corruption, then palpably there is no reason why mankind should concern itself with considerations of the better life. But Lord Acton's dictum is derived from history and history is never a criterion of what mankind is capable of achievement in the future. The dictum denies the fact that man is at times a noble animal, 'with a piece of divinity' in him; only his stupidity and lack of development (imposed by disciplinary control) have deterred him from the practice of the good life. The initial imposition, it must be emphasised, is the imposition solely of conditions. Once these are established man will react to them, and will be 'conditioned' by them. Man has never been other than the product of his environment; to it he is indebted for all that he is and is capable of being. And it is precisely the establishment of the appropriate conditions and environment such as will unconsciously mould the citizen into the perfect democratic being which is the task of the body of philosopher kings or statesmen I have postulated. We need not necessarily be cynics to admit that the most utopian state of which man is capable will be marred by imperfections and recalcitrant elements, but in so far as a man is a product of his environment, he will tend to co-operate and adapt himself to it. That is a natural necessity. Once therefore conditions and environment making for democracy are established, then the emergence of democracy is solely a matter of

time. But the fact that these conditions must be imposed presupposes correctly that anti-democratic opposition is widespread—in the name of individual freedom. It is the case of Satan quoting from the Bible.

Reformatory institutions endeavour to do what the state today fails to do—provide the conditions and environment such as will mould a righteous and worthy citizen. The fact of these institutions is a tacit admission that the state has failed and failed miserably. Yet in the midst of this chaotic inefficiency, individuals cry for freedom and rights which though inherently good are extremely premature. They demand political freedom which to the masses who have been deprived of their economic freedom is meaningless and mockingly ironic. Freedom to disprove the existence of the Deity, and the freedom to cast a vote for one or two grossly unsuitable persons whom nobody knows and nobody cares to know, and freedom to choose between salvation and thirty shillings or less a week. *That* is the freedom of the masses. The contention that premature freedom is inimical to economic equality will be examined in a later chapter.

In the totalitarian dictatorships of today is symbolised the reaction against the chaotic individual freedoms and rights demanded by a minority section of the populace. It suffers from the extreme violence of its reactionary attitude and of its cynical despair. Totalitarianism to them is the only alternative to a democracy that has failed; in waging this war against the Nazi-Fascists therefore we fight the consequences of our own failure. In that it is a doctrine of despair,

Nazism with its fierce suppression and regimentation must be exterminated, but in the process of this extermination we have discovered how wonderfully united the peoples of Germany are. And if the source of this unity is sought, it will be found to be a consequence not of suppression or regimentation but of an important part of the environment—education. The peoples of Germany have been educated and therefore moulded by their environment rigidly enforced around them into the pattern of the perfect Nazi. As the product of their environment they are Nazis in heart and thought and nothing save an extermination wholesale or a violent change of environment can effect a favourable reaction from the German peoples. No creed, least of all democracy, can afford to lack the vigorous and positive support which organised education for it affords. The measure of our unity is the measure of our success in educating the public for democracy. Such an education does not exist, solely because the premature freedom granted to individuals is abused, economic equality denied to masses and education elevated to the dignity of a prize reserved for the fortunate and deserving few.

The last Great War was fought to make England a land fit for heroes to live in, with the result that unemployed heroes walked the streets selling matches and boot-laces and making apologetic attempts on musical instruments, to eke out a meagre pittance. War was fought to end war with the result we are spending fourteen million pounds a day in the bloodiest war of all time. War was fought to ensure freedom for the individual, with the result that countries throughout the world have reacted toward it in violent dicta-

ships. There is no denying the admission that we have made a messy imbroglio of the 'freedom' that was granted us. Clearly the need of a new beginning is manifest; clearly we cannot be satisfied with antiquated methods, and must strike out with a new and nobler conception of freedom—democratic liberty. During the space of the last hundred years, science has forged ahead on an unprecedented scale and its effects upon human life, as considered later, are considerable. The productive and creative power which science has placed at our disposal may be freed from the abuse to which it is being subjected, and utilised for the cause of achieving democratic liberty. In contradistinction to the Nazi-Fascists who in their despair of mankind ever achieving its utopia or near-utopia have turned to totalitarianism, it behoves us to keep alight the fire of hope and invest this virile optimism in a fresh, vigorous attempt to achieve democracy—a vital and living democracy.

The vitriolic Bernard Shaw has declared, 'Free thought is a pretence; democracy an imposture; the Press barons dictate opinion; to record a vote is no consolation for an empty stomach.' It may be ironically pointed out that the very ability which Mr. Shaw manifests in denouncing present democracy as a farce, is unmistakably an evidence of the freedom of speech which the present system concedes to him. But this is a futile and vicious objection. The individual freedom which is common to Mr. Shaw and to other citizens gives rise to a situation in which freedom to advocate a greater democratic liberty, and a greater economic equality, and a finer democratic education, is counteracted by the means of this very freedom and nullified by recalci-

trant and undemocratic elements. Freedom of action detrimental to society and the state and yet within the laws of the country (which cannot be all-embracing) is palpably not democracy. It is argued again that political freedom is a good in and for itself. Precisely so—if it is advocated and introduced in its proper sequence. Political freedom in the present circumstances is inimical to economic equality and liberty which alone lay the foundations of a vital democracy. Economic equality (laying emphasis on materialism) must be established first, for without it democracy is impossible, and political freedom is at best a farce and and at worst a positive hindrance to the achievement of democracy and a better mode of life. Advantage will be taken of political freedom to bring about economic inequality, and thus deny the masses the first condition of a democratic way of life

SUMMARY

Liberty and democracy have been tried but in so far as they are ideals they though not unachievable have eluded mankind. Moreover the stupidity and lack of discipline common to all mankind have acted as a retrogressive influence. The clamour for individual freedom and rights which though in themselves good, are, within the present system and in the present circumstances premature. Individual freedom must therefore be sacrificed for a higher democratic liberty. This is to be achieved by the imposition initially of ordered and disciplinary control by a group of philosopher kings or statesmen comprising the government. All recalcitrant elements inimical to the democratic process will thus be effectively banished,

and the government with the willing consent of the populace will proceed to establish certain conditions and create an atmosphere favourable to the growth and production of the perfect democratic citizen. Man is nothing but the product of his environment, and once this environment is established a vital democracy is a logical inevitability. The cry for individual freedom today within the present chaotic system is motivated either by selfish sectional and vested interests, or is merely the result of an ignorant and myopic reluctance to abandon antiquated ideas of a premature freedom. Economic freedom and equality is a necessary condition of a vital democracy, and political freedom by itself and in itself is a cruel farce. It is divested of its potential good, and can only come to its own in a democratic setting already established by economic common prosperity. Before proceeding to the study of the nature of the imposition of disciplinary control to be brought about by our philosopher statesmen, the consequences of our failure to achieve liberty and democracy must be fully considered. This is done in the next chapter.

CHAPTER TWO

CONSEQUENCES OF DEMOCRATIC FAILURE

THE consequences of our failure to achieve democracy and democratic liberty and our myopic adherence to individual freedom and rights, are numerous and complex. They range over the fields of religion, economics, politics and culture...and the present war for this latter has come in the nature of a climax to all the forces which have been working upon each other for the last hundred and fifty years. The process termed 'debunking' is therefore a characteristic intellectual activity of our time, for it involves a break from the past and a renunciation of all the traditions and beliefs which had hitherto emotionally and spiritually stabilised man in his relations with the universe and fellow man. The evolutionary process, it will be noted, is an extremely untidy and bedraggled affair, for the debunking never ceases at any given time for the benefit of the student or historian. That which replaces that which is originally debunked is itself being continually subjected to scathing tests failing which it suffers immediate renunciation. It is therefore difficult, indeed futile to arbitrarily establish a line of demarcation between the old order and the new order, for the latter tends to become the former even while it is

being laboriously established. That precisely is the measure of complexity and the fascination of the study of politico-economico-sociology (to coin a cumbrous but inclusive phrase). The attitude of mind involved in debunking may be regarded as itself a consequence of the economic tangle brought about since the opening of the nineteenth century. It will thus be considered later in proper sequence.

- The first and inevitable consequence was that of economic failure. The vicious form of 'freedom' took the form of extreme government non-intervention known as the policy of *laissez faire*. How precisely such a monstrous conception ever came to be established in the minds of men it is difficult to conceive. Uncontrolled and therefore necessarily haphazard industrial and commercial competition was advocated on the basis of an ancient French philosophy which declared 'the world evolves itself; let it alone'. The origin of this economic monstrosity may however be found in the fallacy curiously prevalent during the days of Herbert Spencer that the capitalist profit-making system was the natural order of things—that it was indeed part and parcel of the natural evolutionary process. From such a premiss it was contended that to oppose this system by introducing government legislation and intervention was artificial and offensive to nature. Any activity on the part of the state or the Trade Union such as Factory Acts, public health administration, compulsory schooling, and standard rate of wages were regarded as pernicious attempts to supersede the laws of nature and therefore bound to be failures. Wages for instance were natural when they were determined by unrestricted industrial and

commercial competition, and artificial, when they were subjected to state control. The idiocy of this conception is obvious for if by artificial is meant a thing or action brought about by the intervention of man then clearly nothing in a social and economic system can absolve itself from the stigma of artificiality. A social structure cannot exist as distinguished from the human beings that compose it. It is therefore essentially artificial.

In postulating an arbitrary distinction between artificial social phenomena and natural phenomena, those who advocated unrestricted individual freedom of industrial and commercial enterprise were committing themselves to so much nonsense — and not very enlightening nonsense. That they failed to realise this truth is our misfortune, for the trend of world affairs would manifestly have differed greatly if this economic fallacy had not been adopted. However the rapid industrialisation of the world introduced in the middle of the eighteenth century, ushered in the most vicious era of capitalistic *laissez-faire* industrial competition, regardless of the welfare of the working masses. It is an ironical fact that the forces of science which first indirectly engendered industrialisation and the rise of extensive capitalism, are themselves now being invoked against the old capitalist order in favour of a more equitable and efficient democratic and socialistic system. In all fairness however, it must be admitted that in the early days of industrialisation and of the policy which held the acquisition of personal power and wealth as the ultimate good, the working classes and the community enjoyed the scientific and constructive progress which such self-aggrandisement involved. Rail-

ways, roads, public utilities and the like, were all a direct benefit to the community. Thus though the whole conception of *laissez-faire* was an egregious folly, its damnable implications were never fully realised in the midst of the marvels of rapid scientific industrialisation. We doubt indeed if such a realisation could have effectively checked the pernicious process of capitalised industrialisation, for the materialistic outlook on life based solely on terms of acquisition for pocket and stomach, was rapidly coming into its own. The comparatively placid atmosphere of the pre-industrial period was shattered by a spirit of grasping acquisitiveness. The conception of life as a struggle, bitter and hard, giving no quarter and receiving none was a totally new rendering of human life in terms of selfish greed and individual 'freedom'. Every raw-boned youth making his way out into the world was thus presented with a philosophy wholly inimical to any co-operative attempt for the common good. There was no consciousness of the possibility of achieving the good life through co-operative endeavour. The warning implication of every parent to his son was — 'fight for it'. And in the economic struggle that ensued, as in love and war, any and every weapon of self-aggrandisement was accounted fair and justified.

Scientific industrialisation was in itself an inherent good. Applied science has increased the quantity and improved the quality of manufactured goods; the drastic mess into which human affairs were flung was a result not of the industrialisation but of the failure on the part of the existing political system to harness the new tremendous powers which science provided for the common good. We still continue to suffer from

this failure, as witness the diabolical uses to which scientific discoveries have been degraded in this war. It is not science therefore but man's incapacity to realise its implications that brought about the situation in which so-called civilised human beings engaged themselves with no sense of responsibility to the community and to the dignity of their race, in unrestricted individual acquisition of wealth and power.

Though we in this century are greatest sufferers of this outrageous economic system, we may in a charitable moment concede that initially the advocates of the *laissez-faire* conscientiously regarded capitalist free enterprise as a natural good. Competition would ensure, they argued, the most beneficial rates (i.e. the cheapest) for the consumer. Also under the vivifying spirit of unrestricted competition, progressive scientific methods would be evolved to the general advantage of the community. The objective of personal economic interest meant nothing other than the providential furthering of the interests of all. Maximum production would be ensured by the profit-motive. Such an argument extensively used in the early days of *laissez-faire* is one which no economist would dare to use in the face of the growing hostility which it has of late evoked. It is an anachronism of the Victorian age. Yet in spite of the perfectly manifest necessity of scrapping such an outmoded economic system, especially in view of the almost unanimous agreement that it cannot be applied and its enforced application cannot be tolerated under modern conditions, efforts are made rather to tinker within the existing capitalist system, than to advocate boldly the establishment of a totally new and reinvigorating plan of economic action.

Moral considerations, it is understandable, have no cognisance in the field of practical economics ; but it is curious to note how the practicability of a business deal fails when it flouts moral law. And we have yet to see an attempt made to reconcile the intense profit-making motive under the capitalist system with moral principles of service and co-operative endeavour. The conception of service is now superseding that of private profit though the transformation is not quite complete.

If therefore we are to absolve advocates of the warped capitalist system from moral blame during the early period of the launching of the industrialised capitalist enterprise there can be no doubt of the blame and responsibility that attaches to them subsequently when it was clearly revealed the *laissez-faire* far from conducing to the good of the community was actually a pernicious and disintegrating force which, as the welfare of the community demanded, should be politically exorcised. But in expressing indignation, we fail to heed the human element which has ensured that no class once possessed of power ever voluntarily abdicates from its dominant position. From the acquisition of wealth and position to the logical step of taking measures to ensure their continued possession, is a natural one.

Enterprise and efficiency were worshipped as values, and every economic competitor was infused with the spirit of self-aggrandisement, fully conscious of the desirability of getting the better of others. The more enterprising (a process recognising no moral boundaries) rose to positions of wealth and power on the heads of their fallen adversaries. This was translated in the

language of the time as 'success', and is still to a certain extent so, even in our day. An attempt may be made for the advocates of free capitalist enterprise which may to a certain degree extenuate their guilt, an argument which has the rare merit of being plausible. This is what is termed the blindness of economic action--a theory of economic capitalist failure which is more interesting than apologetic. Emphasis is laid upon the inexorable and irrevocable nature of economic action which sets economic forces functioning, towards consequences which are as disastrous as they are unavoidable. Events, seemingly move to their predestined conclusions with all the finality of the evolutionary process of nature. This is an economic interpretation of the phenomena with which Hardy's books have made us familiar. Neither the present war nor the last Great War, neither the growth of unemployment nor the economic

may wilfully commit themselves to actions which, realise, though conducing to their own profit, will ruin an industry at the other end of the world into ruin. This in itself is an irrefutable argument in favour of immediate reform, though this by no means excludes the number of ills of which we would accuse the private profit system of capitalism.

The most damnable result of this monstrous economic folly was pictured in the life of the working classes, most of them condemned to an existence of illiteracy, vulgarity, indecency and grovelling misery. Stunted physically, mentally and spiritually they led out an existence unable to come within a shadow of distance of all that makes life worth living. They denied the opportunity of living the higher life which man alone among the animals is capable of; were even in this era of civilisation and enlightenment made subject to the law of the jungle which dictates that the right to exist and obtain the necessities of life must be fought for. Fought for; as though men of dignity and wisdom and sense of brotherhood could ever tolerate such vile and atrocious insensibility to the moral decencies which are basic to any civilisation. One is almost tempted, in surveying the mass of human misery and hardship engendered by the selfishness of the few, to claim wickedness and not stupidity as the fundamental cause, but as we have emphasised, and will emphasise later, we are all the product of our environment which constitutes what we are and dictates to an overwhelming degree what we do. We are incapable of controlling the forces which unwittingly start functioning; we are swept along by them helplessly and invariably unconsciously.

psycho-analysis more and more tends to incline to the view that even the original impetus driving us to any action is not free-willed but the result of complex forces working within ourselves. This explanation leaves room for the undoubted influence of the free will which cannot wholly be ignored, but it must be stressed that our decisions and actions are to so great an extent moulded by our environment and inner forces that the element of vicious evil rarely enters into the considerations of the agent. Here again we cannot ignore the presence of incorrigible irresponsible elements who do not care to disguise their willingness to flout all human moral decencies and to ruin and warp human lives and even to cause death for the sake of their own pecuniary advantage. Condemnation of such incarnations of wickedness (not stupidity) are quite understandable, but if a broad and tolerant outlook is maintained (which of course is impossible to the direct sufferers), it cannot be denied that even these out and out anti-social elements are themselves what they are in consequence of the environment and social structure into which they were born. Nazi-Fascism and Hitler may be thus calmly and dispassionately considered, but we will study them later in this light.

The demand which the common man puts before society and the state is not freedom, freedom to sell matches or boot-laces, freedom to choose between someone's doorstep and the workhouse. He demands the right and opportunity as a man living, in a social system making pretensions to democratic living, to live a reasonably secure and full life; the opportunity to contribute from whatever capacities he has to the common store

and to receive in return the benefits of the capacities of others. Ultimately he demands Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness in a vital democracy. Instead the world today gives him thirty shillings a week to support a family, feed them, clothe them, house them and protect them. It gives him a parson to preach contentment and respect for the social hierarchy, and if he isn't careful gives him twenty-nine shillings instead of thirty at the slightest excuse. It accuses him of not being grateful, of being ill-mannered, and implies that he is inferior and that he is fit only for the station in to which he was born.

The cult of the acquisition of wealth and power continues today with unabated fury; its characteristic is restrictive destructiveness. Wealth and power are acquired not so much through construction as through preventing construction; not so much through the provision of more and better articles and supplies of food, but through the cornering and restricting of such supplies; not through the development of the country as through the damnable hold-up of the country, and the betrayal of one's homeland. That is the abominable and obnoxious cult of stomach and pocket. Mass destitution, low wages, long hours, bad housing, insufficient food...these it is claimed by the class of landlords and capitalists are 'natural' to the masses, ordained by nature, and they would even invoke the name of God to justify their attitude of indifference and selfish greed. The history of man on this earth has revealed numerous instances of injustice and wrong inflicted upon innocent members of the human race, but surely none could have caused the pain and suffering and anguish so diabolically and infuriatingly inflicted

on the masses by the pious governing class of capitalists. That such a monstrosity of injustice should have for so long been tolerated can only be attributed to the social inertia of society and the tremendous power vested in the capitalist governing class.

It is as we have indicated difficult to ascertain what our attitude towards this governing classes should be, whether they should be studied dispassionately as disagreeable social phenomena resulting from forces over which they have no control, or whether they should be regarded simply as what they probably appear to be...economic blood-suckers, undermining all that civilisation has achieved to date. Any element of hatred and deep-rooted conception of class war is inimical to a just and prosperous reconstruction, involving as it does co-operative good-will and understanding. It is difficult to command such self-discipline, but the spirit of co-operative reconstruction cannot tolerate tendencies toward hatred and vindictive vengeance. If a calm and constructive attitude is adopted, the immensity of the task confronting social workers will be seen to be truly formidable, yet not invulnerable to a determined and scientifically-planned experiment. The nature of this experiment and the forces which are inimical to it and which must therefore be overcome will be reviewed in a later chapter.

The incalculable benefits which science has enabled mankind to command have been so prodigally and selfishly squandered, that war and human suffering and misery are paramount where logically a common prosperity and higher democratic civilisation would have been the corollary to such scientific progress.

Man having committed himself to economic actions which he could, even if he wished, not retract, the consequences of blind economic action of which we have written above were inevitable. The sum total of the result is that the benefits of nineteenth century material progress are accessible to a minority, while the majority consists of class slaves in various stations of life. The following in a Fabian essay, are eight facts, given by Mr. Francis Williams as representative of the grades of inequality which the present system of capitalist government engenders:

a) The infantile death-rate in Glasgow is one hundred and nine per thousand. In the pleasant and prosperous county of Surrey it is forty-two per thousand. In Hertfordshire it is thirty-eight per thousand.

b) Eleven thousand babies now die every year who would be saved if the infantile death-rate throughout all Britain could be brought down to the level of the comfortable Home Counties.

c) Fifty-four thousand people of all ages would be saved from death every year if the death rate, age for age, in the industrial areas such as South Wales, Lancashire, Yorkshire and Durham, was brought down to the level existing in the Home Counties.

d) For every baby that died shortly before the war of pneumonia and bronchitis in middle class homes, five hundred and seventy-two babies died in poor homes.

e) Thirty per cent of the population, or approximately sixteen million people, had, before the war less to spend on food than was required to purchase the minimum B. M. A. diet regarded as necessary to maintain health.

f) Eighty per cent of the total capital (wealth) of Britain belongs to six per cent of the people.

g) Of the twelve million families in Britain eight million have as their total savings—as their total guard, that is, against future disasters—less than £100. Half of that eight million have less than £2. The entire property of most of this bottom four million consists merely of what they stand up in and of a few sticks of furniture.

h) Although because of a substantial rise in the total national wealth the standard of living of what are known as the working classes has risen considerably over the past hundred years, the share of the total national wealth going to wage earners has actually fallen, not risen during the past three-quarters of a century. It has fallen from fifty-five per cent in 1860 to forty per cent just before the war. Inequality had increased, not decreased.

These are eight facts, irrefutable and undeniable and brooking no attempt to gloss over them without recognising them as the inevitable truth. They give us a representative conception of the conditions prevalent in one of the most civilised, progressive and wealthy nations of the world. America, popularly accounted to be the land of the prosperous, hardly presents an edifying picture in contrast to her capitalist neighbour, Britain. In 1929 the 36,000 richest American families each received an income of over 75,000 dollars a year. These families in aggregate received ten billion dollars. Twelve million families which had each an income of less than 1,500 dollars in aggregate also earned approximately ten billion dollars. Thus it is apparent that 0.1 per cent of the families (at the top of the American

social scale) receive practically as much as the 42 per cent of the families at the bottom of the scale.

Such a maldistribution of income and such outrageous disparities as we have noted in fact (f) have inevitably led to the break-down of the economic system. This break-down is characterised by that horrible situation with which we have in this century become familiar—the situation in which it is impossible to sell the final products of industry and thus maintain the masses in employment ... The wealthy 0.1 per cent at the top of the social tree are so gorged with luxuries that they do not represent purchasing power, while the forty-two per cent at the wrong end of the social scale are without the means to buy the products, however bitterly they need them. Goods remain unsold, and men and women are thrown out into the streets unemployed and thus becoming poorer still. Attempts have been made in this century to alleviate the situation and various plans and methods such as Roosevelt's New Deal have been formulated; in so much as they are attempts — albeit futile attempts — to better the conditions of the masses, they will be reserved for consideration later. On the whole progressives have fought shy of revolutionary methods and adopted, with exasperating futility, methods of concession and collective bargaining, concerning themselves with comparatively trivial matters, such as wages and hours of work, rather than concentrate their powers upon the major necessity of radically altering the whole economic system on a socialistic basis. Even while it is admitted that the rapid growth of capitalist industrialisation did lead to the rise in the standard of living among the working classes, this was a natural inevit-

ability, for the standards of existence prevalent among the working classes were such that they could hardly be conceived as getting worse. The hypothetical benefit accruing to the working classes through widespread industrialisation was not even a concession on the part of the capitalist owners arising out of any desire to alleviate the conditions of the masses; and if the so-called 'rise' in working conditions was a consolatory factor, it was short-lived and uncertain. From 1780 to 1845 when industry was being rapidly mechanised the workers' standard of life suffered a serious decline; from 1845 to 1895 there came a spectacular rise such as the world had never before witnessed. Since then however there has been a definite fall in workers' real wages, though this has been off-set by increased legislation and social services. The point should be clarified, that however extensive a state's legislative enactment, and however successful the representation of Trade Unions are in contending for better working class conditions, these reforms by themselves do not radically affect the situation. The economic disparity still remains and power still continues to be vested in the wealthy ruling classes. The fact therefore that the greater part of the working classes enjoy what may from the physiological standpoint be regarded as a sufficient livelihood, is little justification for inordinate rejoicing, nor is it a matter for self-congratulation among the governing classes.

Free medical and educational services are necessary social readjustments within the existing system of capitalist enterprise; they are in the nature of a compromise with a set of irreconcilable conditions. Today, the slum-dweller has at his disposal one room for his

family above ground level (note this distinction); in 1840 he and his wife and children grovelled in a corner of an unclean room or a damp cellar, while others less fortunate had no habitation save archways or stairs of tenements. The improvement is manifestly there; only in the name of irony can we term it progress. Slum-conditions today are more widespread than they were in 1840—the result of unorganised industrialisation, inspired by motives of private gain and avarice.

In the pre-industrial period the manual worker in the family unit enjoyed security and welfare arising from the personal relations existing between the employer and the employee. Such close personal contact made impossible the prospect of the former ignoring the working conditions of the latter. The factory system and the concomitant growth of larger concerns, severed personal relations between employer and employee, thus removing the chief restraint on the exploitation of the workers. Political economists insisted that the pursuit of personal profit was definitely desirable and beneficial to the community at large. If this was not an attempt at deliberate rationalising of an illogical and monstrous economic situation, it was no less objectional a tendency to invest capitalist free enterprise with a pious covering of morality, so as to make its supersession the more difficult. Starting as a scientific conception, continuing as a practical doctrine, it attained maturity as a moral rule of conduct... Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* which idealised unrestrained competition as the royal road to national wealth, was followed with even more direful consequences by the theory of Malthus that the population naturally increases faster than the means of subsistence which

is ultimately drawn from the soil the productiveness of which cannot be indefinitely increased. It followed then that a check on the growth of population was desirable, and this in nineteenth century England, was possible by any one of the two methods; either through continence or the introduction of contraception; or through the intensification of the struggle for existence among the labour classes, or in other words bringing about of such conditions as would conduce to gradual starvation. Continence and contraception were unsuitable to the Victorian temperament but the alternative of starvation was accepted as a familiar phenomenon by the Victorian gentry. The contemplation by them of the miseries of the working masses evoked mild expressions of regret, such as that which an earthquake or a natural catastrophe in a remote part of the world evoke in us today. The remoteness, almost to the verge of non-existence, of the labouring classes was profound and absolute. Allied to this was, as we have seen, the fallacious economic theory of the time which was definitely against any form of legislation. But more effective than any of these as a bar to the alleviation of the conditions of the labouring classes was the fact that the mill-owners wielded considerable judicial and parliamentary influence, and as the maintenance of the lowest possible conditions in the mills was in their interest, they did not concern themselves with legislative projects. Most of the latter were initiated exclusively by the workers themselves, with the inevitable consequence that the projects remained projects.

We need not inquire into the long and arduous struggle between labour and capital in which the

former sought by degrees to better its conditions, the concessions and legislative victories which the latter slowly surrendered to the former, the brutalities of the early factory system of child-labour, of women and children in the mines. The specific role of the Trade Unions will be considered later. Suffice is it to stress here the magnitude of the barbaric conditions into which the working masses were condemned by an economic system grounded on personal greed and grasping acquisitiveness. Suffice is it to establish the damnable fact that, by this system, democracy as thus moulded, deprived millions of its subjects of the free, vigorous, educated and cultured life to which they rightly lay claim. The life of personality, the life of self-development and culture, which is the ideal towards which man unconsciously strives, was not only denied man, but replaced in conception by the life of squalid materialism, not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself.

SUMMARY

We have in this chapter considered the theory of *laissez-faire* from the national aspect, and as it has affected the individual worker and the conditions in which he is compelled to work. The fact has been stressed that the higher life of personality which is the true corollary of democracy has under this monstrous economic system been denied to millions. An attempt was made to analyse the psychological motives prompting capitalist advocates of the system of *laissez-faire*, even in its attenuated form of today. The consequences of unrestricted free enterprise having been surveyed in the national field, we shall turn to the international aspect of the case, in the following

CHAPTER THREE

INTERNATIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

ANY international consideration of the consequences of the failure of democracy, and of the economic system, must take first and primary cognisance of the war and of the phenomena of Hitler and Nazism. Before turning to these interesting excrescences (they are no more than such), we shall, in order to obviate confusion, reconsider the theory of *laissez-faire* within the limits of the international sphere. For if peace and prosperity have been denied the individual worker within the national state, neither have they been ensured to the world comity of nations. Let us see why.

The theory of *laissez-faire* and the unrestricted capitalist enterprise which it involves, initially lodged the claim that the non-intervention of the state conduced to maximum production at the minimum rates. This was its *raison d'être*. During the first half of the nineteenth century, distinct units of mechanised industries, were engaged in severe competition. Each of these units produced a certain amount of the total national output, and each accordingly sought to capture as much as the existing market as possible. The rate of competitive industry controlled prices, and as indus-

trial technique developed, costs were reduced. Fear of losing markets led to under-cutting, and the consumer benefited to the extent that costs were maintained at a minimum while the output achieved a steady maximum. This, however was an ideal and transient set of conditions which could hardly stand the strain of increasing industrial competition.

In the course of time these conditions were superseded by yet another vicious economic monster—monopoly capitalism. This was inevitable as the scale of production increased, and as the entry of new competitors into the field became increasingly difficult. It was clearly to the advantage of the few remaining major concerns to establish a monopoly by fixing output and prices. In what are now regarded as public services, such as the railways, the supply of water and gas, outright monopoly was both unavoidable and indeed desirable. But in the case of the industrial concerns, they tended more and more to combine into cartels; distinct branches of modern industry introduced price-fixing and formal arrangements as to production were established both on a national and international scale. A few countries such as the United States promptly prohibited this monopolistic tendency, but any such state regulation was singularly unsuccessful.

Apparently the doctrine of *laissez-faire* was not living up to its assumptions, for not only did it fail to guarantee consumers maximum production and minimum prices, but it produced widespread unemployment. The instrument of monopoly in capitalist hands promoted not maximum production but restrictive output and the consequent raising of prices, and when any

one monopoly is not in itself complete, there ensues a bitter competitive struggle between rival monopolists, resulting in artificial inflation in the costs of production. To these costs must be added the considerable costs entailed by advertising, without which no monopoly can ever hope to compete against a rival. Rival monopolists being such, a mutual agreement by which advertisement campaigns could have been excluded from their competitive activities, was a possibility. But neither the one party nor the other could commit itself in the face of the other's determined competition; to have done so would have meant the loss of valuable markets. Alternatively, if rival monopolists were to combine and thus eliminate competition, the combination of cost-saving devices common to both parties, and the absence of advertising costs, would result in cheaper production. But this does not necessarily imply that the resulting supreme monopoly will share the benefits of cheaper production with the consumer—i.e. by reducing prices. This indeed, does not logically follow, for the more extensive the monopoly, the greater possibilities exist of the consumer being subjected to economic pressure. Whatever particular set of conditions exists therefore, so long as such conditions are within the capitalist system, and so long the theory of the *laissez-faire* in part or whole is fundamentally present, there can be no assurance whatsoever of maximum production at minimum prices. The greatest good of the greatest number, is palpably the ultimate object of any social or economic system, for if it were denied, no system could possibly survive the public's outraged sense of moral values. The theory of *laissez-faire*, consciously or unconsciously, disported itself in a

covering of pious morality, declaring falsely that unrestricted individual enterprise meant the prosperity of the whole community. Whether this elementary error was sincere or was connived at solely for considerations of self-interest and personal aggrandisement, it is difficult to ascertain; such a discovery moreover would serve no constructive purpose.

It has been established beyond doubt, through much suffering and much trial and error, that neither free unrestricted industrial competition nor the alternative of monopoly conduce to the common good of the public. This failure in itself is more than sufficient to recommend the theory of *laissez-faire* to the scrap heap, in company with capitalism. Yet the recommendation has not been made, while the evidence against free capitalist enterprise mounts regularly until not only the national but the more extensive interests of the international world and of the human race, have become involved.

Despite the moral protestations of the early advocates of *laissez-faire*, monopolism which ultimately resulted, was, as its supporters took no pains to disguise, an out and out flamboyant method of material acquisition and benefit at the heavy cost of others. No moral covering could ever camouflage this fact. It constituted an unrestrained spirit of acquisition in its most violent and depraved form, transcending the interests of both the community and the state—interests which it could not recognise, blinded and intoxicated as it was with the detestable and almost primitive desire for excessive material gain. National interests accordingly went by the board in the hunt for profit and grasping opportunities; national monopolistic

groups of capitalists pooled their resources, thus welding together monstrous international monopolies. It will be observed that the economic and social disease engendered by *laissez-faire* was assuming a more and more malignant form in which gigantic political and economic forces clashed acutely and critically; *laissez-faire*, once launched appeared to be implacably, steadily progressing towards a predestined calamitous end. Feeble attempts to check its expanding progress, if they did not by their very opposition precipitate capitalist expansion were of utterly no avail.

Economic forces, aided to a certain extent by science, tended toward the unifying of the world as one economic unit, giving rise to the paradoxical situation of poverty in potential plenty. Ill-clad men and an abundance of cotton, ill-warmed men and an abundance of coffee, starving men and an abundance of wheat, the world's quays and warehouses filled with rotting fish and fruit which cannot be brought into the hands of the people who need them, solely because of an abominable economic system which mankind will not abandon. This spectacle of painful contradictions is the greatest obstacle to democracy with which we have been confronted. The world is overflowing with potential peace and plenty, comfort and competence, but mankind has as yet neither the wisdom nor the spirit to organise the distribution of such wealth according to the precepts professed by democracy.

That civilised men, so called, should have for so long tolerated in their midst, that embodiment of rapacious and sordid greed, the monopoly capitalist; that their moral sense did not revolt against such extortionist principles, is to be ascribed solely to social

inertia. The restriction of supplies, the growing of one blade of grass where two will grow—these methods have grown so repugnant to the conscience of mankind that revolts in any one of a number of forms are inevitable. The climactic revolt from which we are suffering today in the form of a world war, and the consequences of which cannot yet be ascertained, is a disaster that was definitely ensured when monopoly capitalism came into being.

Like a malignant epidemic disease, monopolistic tendencies gained ground at a prodigious rate between 1918 and 1939 when the second great war of the twentieth century broke out. Competitive friction between distinct industrial concerns was reduced to a minimum as monopolism gained supremacy, while competition between rival monopolies assumed a vicious and ugly form. Preferential arrangements, quotas, marketing schemes, regulated systems of bilateral exchange and commercial treaties—these flung the world market into a confusing complexity, permeated with a breathless uncertainty and anxiety, lest the monstrous machine should fail at any one point and fling millions into starvation or unemployment. Let us examine the growth of this complex and chaotic international and industrial situation with greater detailed attention.

The work of the Trade Unions is a subject reserved for later consideration, but a general reference to labour representation is inevitable to the complete understanding of the forces which went to the making of the hellish world in which we exist today. In the light of what we have so far considered, it is obvious that the development of Trade Unions and later of

the Labour Party were not spontaneous creations appearing upon the political and economic scene without reason or justification. They were in the nature of a retaliatory move against the merciless indifference of capitalist industrialism: either Trade Unions or similar bodies had to be evolved or, in the face of capitalist enterprise, labour had to collapse into grovelling disintegration. They therefore had no alternative but to band together and at least exploit the advantages of collective bargaining. This was an absolute necessity under the circumstances and conditions then obtaining..... Without political representation or economic power and faced with the alternative of either starving or working on wages barely sufficient for a working man's needs, the masses were forced to tolerate the conditions in which they found themselves. As the scope of capitalist industrialism expanded, the need of a collective representation of labour to ensure the minimum rights of the working man, and to obtain the highest possible wages and favourable working conditions, became self-evident. The more intense capitalist competition grew, and the more monopolistic the industrial situation, the work of the trade unions proportionately increased in activity. Labour was simply led on to one commitment after another within the vortex of capitalist economy. This tragic game of colossal human blunder, once launched, continued, inexorably towards its undefined yet plainly disastrous end. Thus in 1900 Labour representation in Parliament consisted of two seats, in 1906 twenty-nine seats. Following the first Great War, when monopoly capitalism expanded on an unprecedented scale, the number of Labour seats in Parliament increased until in the

years 1924 and 1929 Labour Governments were formed.

Furthermore it has been contended as an explanation of the growth of the Labour Party's power and influence, that the English governing classes—said to be a preter-naturally cunning peoples—to a certain degree willingly conceded to the demands of labour to take the revolutionary edge off political discontent. Such a supposition is purely hypothetical in so far as we cannot gain access to the minds of the governing classes. Yet, as an explanation it cannot be ignored, just as it is fatal to impartial judgment to ignore the fact that increasing profits on the part of the capitalist tend to direct their attitude toward labour into more tolerable and humane channels. Whether legislative concessions are therefore to be attributed to cautious cunning (to stave off revolutionary tendencies) or to sheer magnanimity of heart glutted with wealth, it is difficult to decide; the inquiry affords interesting speculation, but is utterly futile. The fact remains that Labour representation grew in and under the shadow of capitalist enterprise. Although theoretically it arose as a force hostile to capitalistic enterprise, it was from the first dependent upon the success of capitalist business for its day to day livelihood; till now ultimately Labour is as much a part of the complete capitalist system as the capitalists themselves.

The Labour representation was not a force without the capitalist system militating against it and championing a revolutionary substitute. It welded itself into the existing economic system and sought concessions which were thrown to them by the governing classes as sops to dull rather than satisfy their appetite for revolutionary transformation.... It sought bread and

better and reasonable working hours, and in the tempo of conflicting competition the idealistic conception of a socialistic revolution completely undermining the present economic regime, was shelved and has been shelved. Theoretically the Labour Party still seeks to achieve its idealistic socialistic state, but its practical activities are confined to arranging a compromise between capitalism and labour within the present economic system. It has lost its revolutionary appetite, though socialistic intellectuals continue to maintain the banner of the utopia to come.....

We have given the foregoing resume in detail solely to stress the fact that the Labour representation is now an integral part of the existing economic system which it does not seek to supersede by introducing an alternative. In so far as the capitalist economic system originally arising from the theory of *laissez-faire*, directly led to Labour representation and unrest, so Labour in its turn, as an integral part of the existing economic system, has paved the way to the climax of war. An attempt has been made, on the basis of this fact, to decry the socialists' and Labour Party's idealistic conception of a utopian society, as hopelessly inconsistent with what is actually committed to practice. It is regrettable that warped thinking and lack of logical independency has lent credence to this absolutely erroneous and unjust view. Labour, it must be emphasised, under the capitalist system is as we have seen an integral part of it; yet this cannot be accepted as Labour's acquiescence to prevalent conditions. Labour should and does, even in a necessarily limited fashion, engage itself in a second role—that of working for a radical alteration of the economic system. Labour

immediate interest is to be conceived in terms of bread and butter and the betterment of its living conditions; achieving which it works or hopes to work towards the evolvment of a socialist world. The former is practical, the latter idealistic. The former is drab and orthodox, the latter revolutionary.

Socialist labour has not, as not a few writers would appear to believe, abandoned revolutionary idealism in favour of the practical bread and butter interests within the capitalist system. It is contended that state legislation and the increasing prosperity of national capitalist industries are reflected in labour by a similar prosperity in the form of rising wages, and that therefore the welfare of the capitalist industries is as much a matter of concern to labour as it is to the capitalists themselves. It may be conceded that within the sphere of immediate interests, labour's attitude toward the capitalist industries by which they are employed may be influenced by the realisation that capitalist prosperity almost invariably means a corresponding prosperity for labour. We may well afford to make this concession, for it is plain that whether or not capitalist prosperity is reflected in labour by a raise in wages, the 'prosperity' of labour is small beer in contrast to the profits pocketed by the capitalists. Furthermore, the rise in labour's standard of living through the expansion of state legislation and interference on labour's behalf, and through capitalist prosperity, does not affect, even to the slightest degree the ultimate source of political and economic power which continues to lie with those owning the principal organs of production. It is therefore damnably hypocritical to suggest, as a few writers on social problems

have done, that the state and capitalist industries have come in the form of liberating messiahs to alleviate the conditions of the labour masses. Whatever the concessions and economic advantages gained by labour either through state legislation or through the efforts of Trade Unions, they are in the manner of rights not willingly conferred and gladly received, but extorted by the sheer force of collective bargaining. The element of gratitude does not enter into a transaction of this nature, and it is accordingly absurd, as a few smug members of the governing class are apt to do, to declare labour as *ungrateful* in view of all the privileges that have been showered upon it.

Anti-socialists, naturally enough, do not appreciate the fact that a radical alteration of any prevailing social or economic order is one of the most difficult and thankless tasks conceivable. Unanimity of opinion as to the methods whereby this transformation is to be achieved, appears to be impossible, while the question as to how precisely socialistic principles are to be practically applied in the post-capitalist age yet remains unanswered—or rather suffers from an abundance of answers, all conflicting and confusing. With the exception of a few socialist leaders, the masses yet have no conception of the socialist creed and are moreover steeped in social inertia hostile to any suggestion of a radical transformation. Bereft of intelligent public support the socialist labour minority can hardly be expected to launch a practical campaign which would most certainly collapse owing to feeble support and strong opposition, and in collapsing create a social upheaval beneficial to none, and harmful to the name of socialism. Yet critics of

socialist labour deride the latter's idealistic conceptions as inconsistent with labour's immediate interests of bread and butter, implying that labour has completely abandoned its dreams in favour of practical acquisition within the prevailing economic system. They all but challenge socialist labour to 'get on' with the construction of a utopian society, if labour is so desirous of freeing itself of the capitalists' fold.....

Socialism will do well to ignore these taunts, realising that they cannot precipitate matters due to an excess of revolutionary feeling; yet there is implied in this caution a tendency towards social inertia. Labour fully recognised the difficulties, the overwhelming difficulties, of any revolutionary transformation in the face of consolidated opposition and in the absence of any semblance of united agreement within the socialist camp, as to the methods or the ends which should dictate their work. The nature of these differences will be studied in a later chapter; here we need only observe the point that the socialist camp was not united and vigorous enough to press home their case either practically or theoretically. Effective leadership which was what the masses principally looked for, was lacking. Disorganised and divided against itself, socialism never was fully championed, and its would be advocates therefore confined themselves to the theoretical and intellectual sphere, making no effort under the prevailing impossible conditions, to satisfy socialist critics by launching futile practical campaigns...A vigorous attempt at rallying the forces of socialism under one camp, reconciling differences, and agreeing to a broad and fundamental plan systematically to publicise and champion the

socialist creed, would have done much to make possible the practical campaign which now remains impossible.

Lacking such inspiring leadership and a unifying force, socialist labour relapsed more and more into the position of concession-seekers, as an integral feature of the capitalist machine. Labour failed to see, or if it did see, failed to act upon the fact, that in the absence of any positive move on their part, the forces of capitalist competition, growing more and more intense would lead to a disaster for which labour would be as much responsible as the capitalists themselves. Labour by its presence within the prevailing economic system, and by the very nature of its role, was contributing in large measure to the economic and social catastrophes which capitalism engendered. We may fully sympathise with Labour's embarrassing and difficult position but its inability to unite in concerted action made possible the uninterrupted progress of capitalist economic forces toward the ultimate catastrophe of war. We will see how this came about.

As the vortex of capitalist (now mostly developed into giant monopolies) enterprise grew increasingly fierce, labour as an inevitable part of the capitalist machine came to indentify its interests with those of the capitalist concerns, by which they were employed. Now, competition in the case of these concerns, necessarily involved competition in the case of labour. Labour could not, even if it had wished, avoid the vicious competition into which it was drawn. Labour groups in different countries, with varying standards of living, although basically with common interests, nevertheless entered into unremitting competition propelled

by the sheer force of the circumstances and conditions created by capitalism. Labour in each country had of necessity to co-operate with the country's capitalist industries.....

Labour is theoretically fluid. Emigration leads to a shortage of labour, and therefore to rising wages; immigration tends to create a surplus of labour, and a consequent lowering of wages. That is the abstract basis upon which labour competition is founded. And it will be observed that this competition between labour groups with varying standards of living, is specifically an international phenomenon, for labour at a low rate of wages is always a source of danger to well-paid labour, whether or not the former immigrant. Ill paid labour in a country with competitive industries tends severely to handicap labour-industrial concerns in a country where labour is well-paid. These few principles propounded here are fundamental, and subject to numerous qualifications of embarrassing economic complexity. The effects of any labour flow either emigrating or immigrating are difficult to assess with finality; only broad results can be established. It cannot for instance be assumed, as it is easy to assume, that immigrant labour is invariably willing to accept lower wages. Apart from the fact that immigrant labour automatically creates new demand (a factor which cannot be discounted), there is no reason why it should not insist on high wage rates; in which case the theoretical conclusion that immigrant labour tends to bring down wage rates is untenable.

We have seen that the closer the relationships between labour and capital, the more the former tends to regard its immediate bread and butter interests as pre-

dominant. Therefore, it logically follows, from this premise, that if any labour group in seeking its own betterment adversely affects the immediate interests of a second labour group, fierce competition between the two is bound to result. International collaboration between labour groups was found impracticable, so great is the disparity of the wage-levels maintained by labour groups throughout the world. This inability to collaborate and equalise the wage-level, naturally left no alternative but a recourse to competition between national groups of labour. We shall see in what manner this competition was conducted.

In the earlier paragraphs of this discussion, we asserted that labour was fluid, but this is theoretical for there are obviously limits to its fluidity...limits which are more appropriately termed barriers. The first check to absolute fluidity of labour was a natural one...the difficulty of ocean transport. The cost of overseas transport however gradually diminished until now it is not prohibitive and well within the means of skilled labour. The world-wide interconnection of transport facilities has at one and the same time reduced natural obstacles to labour fluidity, and contracted the world into a single economic unit. Natural obstacles being reduced to negligible dimensions, absolute fluidity of labour would normally have resulted. And the free emigration and immigration of labour, unhindered by any barrier again would normally have led to a rise in the average world wage-level. Mass migration did indeed start, and the tendency to start this migratory process is still extremely powerful, but the pressure resulting from artificial barriers opposing labour fluidity finds relief only in war.

It is estimated that one hundred million English speaking people are living overseas (this estimate of course takes no consideration of new circumstances brought about by the war). Millions of Chinese have migrated into Manchuria, Singapore, Honolulu, the Dutch East Indies, while Indians, have permeated into Burma, Malaya, East Africa and Natal. Latin America is now a conglomeration of races throughout the world. Inter-breeding is on so widespread a scale throughout the five continents that it is suggested that we shall all be of the mongrel type in the next stage of human evolution.

This urge or tendency to migrate which theoretically results in labour fluidity is a natural phenomenon, dictated by the distribution of potential economic wealth throughout the land hemisphere. The natural attraction being inherent therefore, given absolute labour fluidity, labour would, in accordance with the dictates of economic attraction, distribute itself equitably and peacefully. Such a development would clearly have involved much inter-breeding, the virtual denial of national borders, and a considerable gain in power of the proletariat.

A violent reaction against labour fluidity set in among distinct labour-capitalist national entities which as we have seen previously were solely concerned with immediate interests of pecuniary gain. Where the labour wage-level was high, immediate gain was incompatible with unhindered immigration of cheap labour from abroad. Hence the imposition of artificial barriers to labour fluidity...an imposition for which national labour groups were mostly responsible. Ruthless racial discrimination and enforced separation

of races was the extreme form which this reaction took; barriers and restrictions against coloured and therefore cheap labour were rigidly enforced in such countries as the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa where the wage-levels were comparatively high. Most Asiatics, and especially Chinese and Japanese who tended to be violently emigratory and competitive, were completely barred from entering these countries. Such restrictive legislation was due, if not entirely, mostly to competitive labour groups enjoying higher wage rates. This was undoubtedly the case in the United States where the pressure of organised labour in favour of legislative restriction of the immigration of labour, was too strong and insistent to ignore or oppose.

Although barriers against Asiatic labour were commonly interpreted as colour prejudices, the economic factor which is more fundamental a reason for such labour restrictions must now be accepted as the primary cause of the bar against the Asiatics in the countries named above. But the matter does not rest with the exclusion of cheap labour by restrictive barriers; in the manner of a vicious circle of causes and results which seemingly has no end, the labour barrier leads us to the next stage of this economic tragedy.

Labour restrictions in countries with a higher standard of living imposed a heavy economic burden upon countries such as Japan, India and China, glutted as they were with teeming population. But in one of these countries at least, Japan, a method was devised by which Japanese labour could economically hit back against those labour groups which had set up barriers excluding Asiatic labour. The supply of labour being

greatly in excess of the demand Japanese industrial competitors, on the basis of extremely low labour wages, successfully competed with the industries of Europe and America. Japanese industrial concerns being at an advantage, labour groups in the exclusionist countries were again threatened with unemployment and economic insecurity. Nothing could be more ironical than the fact that the barriers against cheap labour caused such cheap labour to remain at home and become yet cheaper—so cheap that foreign industries could compete successfully against industries in higher wage-level countries, leading to unemployment among the very labour groups which pressed for legislative restriction of foreign labour.

The exclusionist nations retaliated in an even more disagreeable manner—by the introduction of import regulations and tariffs. This it is obvious was an inevitable corollary of the exclusion of labour. This was the final move, for against this labour in poorer countries was incapable of effective retaliation. Forced to a lower level of living, they were now thrown into unemployment. Once recourse was taken to the setting up of tariffs, the practice became a common epidemic, until today there is not a single country which has not adopted a high-tariff policy. Countries which were industrially and economically backward urgently required protective tariffs, while the more advanced countries, in the face of such competitive methods, were not advanced enough to discard tariffs as unnecessary.

In viewing the above tragi-comedy of economic inefficiency, we see that moral factors are absolutely at a discount. Men are as pawns in the power of

implacable economic forces, driven helplessly to catastrophic situations which they had neither foreseen nor if they had, could avoid. It is therefore beside the point to accuse labour groups in different nations as being morally depraved, solely because they were compelled by economic conditions to set up anti-Asiatic labour restrictions, or because they acquiesced to tariffs being imposed against competitive foreign industry. There is indeed ample evidence for contending that varying labour groups do on the whole seek the betterment of labour throughout the world; if it were in their power they would clearly for their own advantage contrive to establish international labour collaboration. But whatever their inherent wishes, the situation is such that they are forced into the vicious vortex of competition, finding labour internationalism incompatible with the immediate practical necessities with which they are confronted. Yet, pathetically enough, whenever possible labour unions have rendered each other financial assistance during periods of acute labour struggles. The trade-union international was organised specifically for rendering such services, but however lavish and ready labour groups were with pecuniary assistance, what little help they were able to render was immediately nullified by their unavoidable policy of excluding foreign labour and foreign goods. The labour attitude toward the refugee problem in England following the Nazi conquest of Europe, is an interesting case in point.

As the standard of living of most refugees from the continent was comparable to that prevailing in England, their immigration into the country failed to affect the wage level. But English labour feared that

the influx of skilled workmen as refugees, would result in acute unemployment. Scholars and capitalists who in aggregate constituted only a fraction of the body of refugees, children, old people and women—in sharp contradistinction to able wage-earners—were accordingly given preference, while productive persons were either barred or if permitted entry into the country, were resettled overseas. Meanwhile Labour Unions contributed lavishly to the upkeep of the tens of thousands of unproductive refugees, living in the country on a dole. These unions manifested a wonderful spirit of humanitarian feeling, but where their interests were threatened, they were naturally adamant.

Fundamentally therefore, we are compelled to accept the conclusion that international labour collaboration is impossible under the present economic system. Legislative restrictions on labour and high tariffs have inevitably created a dangerous pressure—a pressure relieved solely by war. So long as this idiotic and pernicious labour-capitalist competition continues we may be assured of a regular visitation of that curse that is war; mankind will never be rid of this blight. All panaceas and efforts to alleviate the situation if not absolutely radical—that is if they do not seek to eradicate the roots of inequality, ultimately not only suffer frustration, but serve to accentuate the existing inequalities. Merely tinkering with the prevailing economic system is a fatuous futility that emphasises rather than abolish existing economic ills.

Protective tariffs, first adopted by the poorer nations and subsequently resorted to by even the most industrially advanced countries, narrowed down world markets. The ensuing hunt for world markets and

sources of raw materials ushered in what is termed the imperialist phase of the capitalist system. Under the common protection of tariffs, distinct economic units tended to unite in giant combines, seeking to secure and monopolise both markets and sources of raw materials. Protective barriers were ineffective against such combines until they were more rigidly enforced. And the more rigid the barriers, the greater grew the pressure of combines adopting new technical methods to circumvent legislative restrictions. Trade therefore, far from dwindling by the impact of barriers throughout the world, increased in volume and pressure. Capitalist competition, in this monstrous form, continued unabated, ever avaricious and self-seeking...The export of goods into a certain country being prohibited by protective tariffs, recourse was taken to the ingenious method of exporting capital through banks to finance industries in backward countries. This new development constitutes a further stage in the complexity of the interlocking economic-industrial situation of today. We need not concern ourselves with the technicalities involved in this new study, for enough of the economic background has been drawn to illustrate the indisputable actuality that war is an inevitable calamity if civilised mankind persists in clinging to a perverse and outmoded economic system.

We will now pass on to the next stage of our inquiry—i. e. If the prevailing economic policy involves the resultant ills described above, paving the way ultimately to war, does its perpetuation during the war ensure victory? Our assumption that the old economic system still survives may, so inordinately blind are a few diehards, be challenged. They are quite

contending that the exigencies of war, compelling the State to interfere in private enterprise, and the imposition of heavy taxes have completely transformed the old order of things.... The fact is that there has been no change in the fundamental character of the economic system since 1939. Economic power is still centred in people who are incapable of recognising the fact that a total war effort of which maximum production is a condition, is an absolute necessity if victory is at all to be ensured. Let us however, as a concession to these diehard objections, examine the implications of their challenge.

The private employer has since the outbreak of war necessarily been subjected to state control. Supplies of labour, capital, equipment, fuel and raw materials without which the independent employer is helpless, have all passed under Government supervision, while his major if not the sole customer is the State. The immediate profit motive is in abeyance... Yet maximum production at a minimum expenditure of time and costs, is far from being achieved, solely because this objective has not been infused with the emotionalism of the profit incentive. Managers of vital private establishments feel themselves responsible neither to the public nor to the government which is theoretically representative of the public. Company directors and owners of invested capital still constitute the final authority on matters affecting the conduct of private concerns working on contracts with the government. War-time control has abolished, for the duration, any excessive private profit, but the incentive to gain prevalent in pre-war days, has not been superseded by the incentive to maximum and efficient production. There is indeed

no spirited incentive, no up-surge of endeavour, in the productive methods of these private concerns. They have reconciled themselves to the fact of doing without profit, and presumably consider this a sacrifice heavy enough to justify their lethargic indifference to what is clearly their duty to the state. The relationships existing between the state and these private firms, are nothing short of idiotic. In spite of the pressing necessities of war, every attempt appears to be deliberately made to hinder swift and efficient production by selecting the most leisurely methods conceivable. The state, presumably as a gesture of respect to the sacrosanct entity that is the private firm, refrains from ordering the production of certain materials for the public interest, but gracefully invites tenders. Contracts are then entered into between the state and the said private concern, the outcome of which is that the latter emerges with substantial profits which, by taxation ultimately finds its way into the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

In the absence of any profit incentive, private concerns accept government contracts, solely because the state is their only customer while the war is on. Their purpose during the course of the war is not so much public service, as ensuring as far as this is possible that they do not commit themselves to any move or scheme which would, in the post-war era, hinder the resumption of the private-profit enterprise. And maximum production obviously is inimical to monopolistic restrictive production; they are directly antagonistic. Yet people who are trying to achieve unsuccessfully a compromise between the two alternatives, are retained in positions of trust and influence.

Ironically enough, the directors of private monopoly concerns are invariably appointed as the state's servants—permeating the whole economic and productive system with the impossible dual policy of maximum production as necessitated by a total war, and restrictive production, as necessitated by considerations of private gain in the post-war era. Men who during the pre-war era were adepts at producing one blade of grass where two or three might be made to grow, are hardly the persons in whom a sane state would entrust maximum production for the successful prosecution of the war. Yet, that is precisely what is being done. The redundant complexities of tenders, contracts, sub-contracts and sub-subcontracts continue while any consideration of the public interest demands that the achievement of maximum production at a minimum of costs and time is imperative if a total war is to be waged. The spirit that propelled the capitalist public to a frantic attempt to sell lead, nickel, copper, rubber and other materials to Germany during the last week before the outbreak of war, is the spirit that is still dominant today. A spirit that is inimical to democracy in peace, and to victory in war.

SUMMARY

As a brief conclusion of the case against the economic decay, we may establish (1) that the present economic system which is a cross-breed between *laissez-faire* and planned capitalism is painfully inadequate, in that it fails to provide the greatest good for the greatest number. Maximum production at a minimum of costs for the social service of the public is the foundation of a vital democracy. The continuance

of this economic farrago is inimical to the reconstruction of a new democracy. (2) That it inevitably deprives the labouring masses of the possibility of leading the life of personality which also is a necessary condition of a vital democracy. (3) That it engenders vicious nationalism, leading to the calamity of war, and (4) That even in war it makes no provisions of victory. Lastly, we may emphasise that no capitalist economy recognises moral conditions involved in public service, and though in this materialistic age moral factors are at a discount, there is a limit to the general public's sense of human decencies which the present economic system has outraged. Chapters Two and Three formally complete the economic survey as one aspect of the whole; we need hardly point out however that in continuing to the next aspect in the following chapters, the economic basis will be continually in the background, for it is fundamentally necessary to the complete understanding of the harmonious whole.

CHAPTER FOUR

DECAY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF

IT may occur to the reader that this present chapter is a digression and that it cannot possibly constitute a logical continuance of the arguments enumerated in the preceding sections. Such however is not the case. We are today uneasy witnesses of a catastrophic climax to several forces of disintegration of which economic decay is one, and of which the decline in religious belief and the contemporary failure of the Established Church is another. In the interests of a complete and harmonious conception of the forces which have gone to the moulding of the chaotic world of today, it is necessary, indeed imperative that due consideration be given to the partly ignominious and partly noble role which religion has played in the vast drama of mankind's drift to the present war. As we have stressed in the conclusion to the preceding chapter, economic considerations can never be ignored without severe detriment to the final and proper appreciation of the subject under review—which at present happens to be the role of religion in the present and post-war world. The economic basis cannot be divorced from any study that inquires into the nature of society and state; and religion specifically, in the broadest and essential sense of that word, has invariably been a primary content of

society's consciousness.

Orthodox religions have in common with most traditional beliefs and customs, been consigned to the melting-pot, yet the important fact has not been stressed enough that the religious essence or religious consciousness still remains. The legitimate role of the melting-pot has unfortunately been misconceived, for its task is not as is popularly supposed, to abolish but to condense. It is not to be confused with the cynical indifference of debunking which seeks to discredit rather than reduce to essentials. Orthodox religion then, has been the chief victim of the melting-pot attitude of mind, an attitude of patient inquiry, accepting nothing on assumption or hearsay. The melting-pot has reached the climax of its work in our era, but in its first inception it developed in close parallel to the progress of science. For obviously the consciousness of new power and of his intellectual supremacy, infused man with the courage to question and doubt what had hitherto been accepted with the supine awe of the ignorant. Man adopted also the scientific attitude of mind which stood him in good stead, in his abrupt reaction against the old order. Almost simultaneously science was being applied to the industries, giving rise to the decadent economic system surveyed in the preceding chapters. How far the introduction of this economic system contributed to the decay in religion, or how far the decay of religion paved the way for the development of capitalism in increasingly vicious forms, is a controversial point, into which we need not enter. This impossibility of specifically ascertaining causes and effects, is indicative of the complexity of inter-woven forces continually moulding society.

Before we make a rapid survey of the cultural conflict between the forces of religion and those of science, we must first establish the *raison d'être* of such a survey—that is, precisely indicate, why and where religion has failed humankind in this critical hour of man's sojourn on this earth. Has religion failed at all? Is it not more accurate to assert that man has failed religion, and not religion man? These are suggestive queries which deserve consideration, and in answering them we clear the ground for the main theme of this chapter.

We have stressed the fact elsewhere, that we need bring only one damnable indictment, among numerous others, against the old order—that it supported those conditions which gave rise to the war. Now, organised religion, we have seen was an integral part of the order which prevailed in pre-war times, and as such is as culpable as the general order of things, of which it was a part. This fact alone, is sufficiently implicating enough to justify our claim that the Church has failed, not so much because of any intrinsic failing, but because of its inability to adapt itself to rapidly changing conditions. If democracy, as we have described elsewhere, is to be tried again, then the Church must, by the same token, be reorganised for the requirements of a new and vital democracy...Already the melting-pot of public opinion has reduced religion to what we have termed its essence; it is swirling somewhere in the depths of the melting-pot, but few have as yet suggested the probability of this pliable and protean essence being moulded afresh for the requirements of a new post-war world. Yet this religious essence is our hope and salvation, for from it must be

DECAY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF

derived the inspiration or emotional stability without which no society can hope to bear the pressure of the conditions which the world has generated. Religion, therefore, is an absolute necessity in any society; the present era has for many excellent and right reasons, abandoned orthodox religion, but it cannot be asserted that our era is the better for the fact of mere abandonment. Religion has failed man, but it has also failed itself, for somewhere, somehow, it went wrong. Let us see how and where.

The present war is unique in that it has initiated a renaissance of the spirit of progress, it has aroused the people of all nations to the realisation of the necessity of here and now ruthlessly cutting ourselves off from the errors of the past, and reconstructing anew. A great dynamic is working among the masses of the world, causing their minds to think reconstructively in terms of the new future rather than of the antiquated and static past. Now this dynamic force should normally be identified with religion, for it is the role which is specifically that of religion in times of chaos and tribulation. Yet, religion is anything but dynamic. It is today complacently static, concerning itself with vague vapourings of a heaven beyond life while there is hell this side of the grave-stone. Religion, as history reveals, has ever been the major source of hostility to all scientific progress; it has assumed the guardianship of traditional respectability and of the old unjust class-ridden society of the past. It still continues today to be the bulwark of the privileges of the upper classes. In the revolutionary situation in which we are placed today, when peoples in the mass, so greatly forsaken by government and religion,

look to the future for succour and for peace and prosperity and happiness which have for so long been denied them, organised religion has thrown its weight in favour of the perpetuation of the old order with all its manifest ills and shortcomings. It is not the intellectual who has dedicated himself to advocacy of science, but the common man in the street who has been aroused to the quickening realisation that his religious conceptions must be re-oriented, and that the time is at hand when social inertia and lethargy must be superseded by a demand for the truth and nothing but the truth regarding man's relations, in this hour of crisis, to his Maker. Herein lies the final disintegration of religion; it has lost its grasp over the masses and lives only in so far as it serves to maintain the supremacy of the governing classes. Yet today, advocates of orthodox religion are capable of a grand irony—for, with their tongue in their cheek, they declare that the panacea to all the ills from which mankind suffers today, is a return to religion. Be it noted that religion calmly accepts or assumes the role of a panacea for the ills for which religion itself must be held responsible. Such a facile strategy is as laughable as it is worthy of the severest condemnation; it is nothing more than an attempt to cash in on the crass stupidity of the public. But the masses now are more suspicious than stupid, more hostile and independent minded than sheepily acquiescent.

At a time when it is religion's role to be *with* the people, it continues to ally itself with those conditions which have retrogression rather than progress as their fundamental purpose. In its role of the guardianship of the governing classes, it has tended more and more

DECAY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF

to concern itself with things of the spirit, and leave materialistic and secular matters to the governing classes it so skilfully shelters from the critical barbs of the discontented public...It has succeeded in spiritualising the gospel, emphasising that happiness and heavenly bliss lie in a fantastic world beyond this life. It preached contentment and peace to millions who asked not for contentment or peace, but for justice here on this earth; it preached respect for the social hierarchy, and satisfaction, for whatever the social and economic conditions, that was how God ordained it... Christianity then, obviously, had little or no intention of concerning itself with man as he was on this earth, or with the social ordering of secular life; it was so busy uttering unutterable things and so concerned with dealing out faiths, that it overlooked the fact that millions have today been deprived of the very means necessary for the fundamental decencies of human life. It mouths prophecies of the Kingdom of Heaven, while it does not trouble its conscience about the social and economic order with which it has allied itself. This order is in direct contradiction to the teaching of Christianity, and we will not insult the intelligence of the Established Church by assuming that it was all along unaware of the fact of this contradiction.

The Church has preached happiness and contentment in a heavenly world to come; how much has it done to achieve these values for the common masses? It has preached universal brotherhood; how much has it done to perpetuate class hatreds and prejudices? It has preached equality in the sight of God; how much has it done to abolish inequality in the sight of men? It

has preached peace in the hearts of men ; how much has it done to denounce war or abolish the conditions making for war? It is not without significance that the Conservative party issued a statement deploring the increasing materialism of the people, urging them to concentrate on matters of the spirit; thousands of pulpits throughout Christendom are delivering identical propaganda of pious fraud.

If the present British Government is conservative, the Established Church has been nothing but that ever since it sent Giordano Bruno to the stake. It has thrived in its conservatism, without any specific purpose in mundane affairs save to maintain the existing social and economic order ; meanwhile in the interests of the governing classes it preached spiritual things to the common masses—masses exploited and driven by a dastardly economic system recognising no moral restrictions whatever in its grasping acquisitiveness.

The above considerations, blunt and harsh, though they may be, are not on this account to be deprived of their value which is the measure of their truth. They reveal that the failure of religion lies precisely in its relations with the state and government; it has not allied itself with man, woman and child but with rulers and governors enjoying the fruits of an economic system functioning wholly in their favour. Jesus, the founder of Christianity, it may be pointed out, stood for the oppressed against the oppressor, for the poor against the wealthy, for the commoners against the rulers both temporal and spiritual. The Established Church has allied and is allying itself against the teaching of its own Master... Herein it has failed itself.

DECAY IN RELIGIOUS BELIEF

The oligarchy of governing classes, the government of pious statesmen and scheming politicians, and the organised Church; they constitute a perfect triangle of three corners. The picture is harmoniously complete if we place the public school educational system in the centre. (More will be said on this subject subsequently). The masses have enjoyed democratic representation in government—a government dominated by oligarchic influence, and conducted by politicians mostly selected from the ranks of the governing classes. In the spirit of co-operative teamwork, the Church played its role by sedulously staving off the revolutionary tendencies of the public, preaching contentment and love to masses who have not the slightest conception of what these emotive terms stand for.....The conspiracy—conscious or unconscious—against the welfare of the people has been complete. Never in the realm of hypocrisy have so many been wronged so much by so few.

Is it therefore a source of wonder that any movement that conceives itself as tending toward true democratic freedom, and toward a progressive society wholly foreign and hostile to the existing economic and social disorder, is essentially irreligious, anti-Christian and materialist? The Church has willed by its own actions that the intelligent public should react in this manner; it has for once underestimated the gullibility of the public, for the present war has so fundamentally and profoundly affected the foundations of society that the man-in-the-street has come to suspect and then to know that these foundations are rotten to the core. While the victory of man's intelligence over the Church is not complete, religion still continues to cash in heavily on the stupidity of the ignorant masses whose

intelligence do not correspond with the average...The social and spiritual malaise brought about by this renunciation of orthodox religion will be dealt with in a later section of this chapter. It is time now to study religion's role from the aspect of its historical struggle against science.

This conception of a struggle between the sciences and orthodox religion naturally presupposes a hostility which will brook no compatibility. Yet, it is contended that science and religion can not only be reconciled but that they may successfully complement each other... Such an assertion however is not as alarmingly unorthodox as would appear at first sight, for obviously, religion as used in the sense of reconciliation is being identified with the sense of wonder and of a marvellous mystery aroused by the scientist's increasing knowledge of the fascinating plan of the world and the universe. This sense is a constant awareness of the God that is Truth; scientific workers are consequently found to be profoundly religious men and women, though they do not espouse the mumbo-jumbo and abracadabra of orthodox religion. The scientist's conception of God is a religion that has been reduced to its essence; it is a subject studied later in this chapter.

What must occupy our attention for the time being is not the scientific and essential religion, but the inevitable opposition between science and the organised religions. The historical origins of this cultural conflict, however remote, are nevertheless the outcome of inevitable friction between restrictive conservatism and expanding progress. We need not recapitulate in detail the familiar stories of the opening scenes of the struggle between science and the Church; a rapid

summary will suffice to harmonise the conglomerate picture which we wish to present.

Without committing ourselves to the finicky desire to seek ultimate roots and causes, we may establish the fact that the first scenes of this cultural drama of conflict occurred approximately four hundred years ago, when the insurrection of Renaissance culture first threatened the strongholds of a theology rooted in philosophical prestige and vested with political power. Monastic restrictions and the mental discipline of the Middle Ages had long denied the masses any intimation of the new light that science, though still in its embryo stage, had shed upon the field of human knowledge. The first rumblings of battle were heard when Copernicus in contravention of the biblical account that the earth was the centre of the universe, declared in a guarded statement to the Pope, that the earth was simply one of a number of planets revolving round the sun. Copernicus, though a genius, had not the reforming zeal of those who cannot tolerate untruth and unnecessary imperfection. He therefore refrained—albeit wisely—from any insistent demand that his discovery should be granted authoritative recognition. The poor man even went to the precautionary step of informing the Pope that other interpretations, less revolutionary, and more accommodating to the account of the universe contained in the Bible, were quite possible and indeed probable. The Pope majestically deigned to ignore the full implications of Copernicus's discovery...But unfortunately there were even in those days of strict religious mental authoritarianism, a few independent minds quite capable of grasping the realities of scientific discovery. The

Church despite its undisputed secular power, had failed to achieve a complete victory over the human mind; here and there a few recalcitrant and inquiring minds refused to accept the dogma of established opinion, welcoming with all tolerance of the Athenian Greeks, scientific revelations such as that of Copernicus.

Giordano Bruno was inclined in this revolutionary way; sincere, practical and courageous, he noised abroad the news of Copernicus's new theory, under the erroneous assumption that both the Church and the people were as tolerant and progressive minded as he was himself. He realised his error, when the Church aroused by this direct threat inherent in Bruno's vigorous challenge against the biblical falsity, set its machinery of persecution functioning with relentless finality. As one writer has described it Bruno was sent to the stake 'for the good of his immortal soul and in the interests of a stable European society'. The Church had hitherto tolerated scientific theories, tainted though they were with seditious and insurgent characteristics, realising that theories if they remained such and nothing more, were harmless. Bruno, however, exemplified an attitude of mind definitely hostile to the interests of the Church; he and his kind would never rest satisfied till the whole structure of the orthodox Church had been undermined. That the Church so definitely and immediately recognised the threat to its supremacy is a credit to its undoubted intelligence; though it could not then have envisaged the possibility of religion being set at a rout a few centuries hence.

Galileo, as we all know, followed the same fate as that of Bruno, for holding a similar heresy. Vigorous

persecution and an alert inquisition thus disposed of the first indiscretions of scientists, but in persecution the Church wielded a dangerous and futile weapon, for there is nothing so stimulative of progressive thought than inquisitional repression. Scientific inquiry developed under the shadow of ruthless opposition, but nothing, least of all physical oppression, could nullify the effects of the gradual but steadfast permeation of human thought by scientific ideas, or retard the development of the human mind towards intellectual enlightenment.

In common with all those forces which have moulded human society, the force of religion and the force of science, when once given the necessary impetus implacably work out their destinies to the ultimate conclusion. Thus, religion challenged, continued to retaliate; science, oppressed, nevertheless maintained its search for Truth. The physical sciences had already wreaked considerable havoc, and the Church, though still a formidable and massive opponent was definitely in retreat; but science skilfully pressed home its attack with vigour and thoroughness.....To those who could grasp the demoralising implications of these new scientific theories which proved that the biblical account of the creation of the universe was nothing more than the veriest fairy tale, arising from the mists of antiquity, the situation was nothing short of painfully embarrassing. They realised that the acceptance of the scientific argument against religion would ultimately mean the absolute surrender of the latter to the former. There could be no compromise, no quarter given or received.

In the wake of the physical sciences came astronomy, geology and the biological sciences all of which compelled what had hitherto been mysteries to yield up their claims to the supernatural. Superstition and awe, though they continued to survive, were to a considerable degree superseded by a new sense of power and mastery in keeping with the natural dignity of man. Man became conscious of his undoubted intellectual supremacy, as he did of the fact that in the area of human experience reverence arising from ignorance could be minimised by increasing scientific inquiry and knowledge. The maturity of personality and mental stature was an object of man's unconscious striving; it was therefore supremely irksome to remain static in intellectual subservience to the domination of the conservative Church. The very physical body of man was thus in its turn, discovered to be replete with a number of regrettable flaws—the body which had hitherto been thought of as the crowning achievement of five days of stupendous creation. In surveying the advance of this vast cultural battle, we must confess, even in regard to the situation as it is today, that the tenacious obstinacy and unflagging spirit of the organised Churches struggling against undoubted odds, must be granted their due measure of admiration. Great, no doubt was their guilt in hindering the progress of humanity toward light and freedom, and overwhelming their responsibility for having maintained the masses in intellectual blinkers, but nothing is lost by science in giving them the victor's recognition of a worthy foe. The Church attempted, heroically, by every means in their power, spiritual and temporal, to counteract the spreading and devastating

influence of science. Pressure was brought to bear on those who professed belief in the theories of science, especially if these recalcitrants were dependent upon the Church for their livelihood. The Church without compunction turned the economic screw on all those whom she thus had in her power. Threatening severe financial retribution, the Church succeeded in compelling not a few scientists to recant in public and sign documents renouncing their discoveries and insurrectionary theories.

The Church however was hopelessly handicapped; it had no reserves while science was continually bringing up fresh reinforcements. Religion suffered from the disadvantages of being, however viciously, on the defensive, while the sciences vigorously maintained their offensive, exploiting every advantage thus accruing to them. In the later half of this stupendous cultural battle, biology entered the field with Darwin and his 'bulldog' Huxley as its major exponents. They were a formidable and terrifying pair, and it is well-known how the latter set Bishop Wilberforce at an ignominious rout at a meeting of the British Association in 1860. The venerable bishop had attempted unwisely to ridicule the humiliating though illuminating theory that human kind was descended from ruder animal forms; Huxley met this ridicule with a water-tight indisputable logical argument, such as that no argument, certainly not derision, could pierce. This cultural clash between two leaders of both camps during one of the most acute and critical stages of the struggle between the Church and Science, illustrates an interesting point that must be enlarged upon. Bishop Wilberforce, representing the Church, resorted to ridicule in his

that traces of animism and taboo are firmly embedded in our modern culture.

Whatever our initial beliefs and religious tendencies, comparative anthropology indisputably presents a picture in which all the orthodox religions—Christianity, Buddhism, Mohammedanism and other minor beliefs,—have a cognate source of inspiration in the puerile terrors, and ecstatic fantasies of ignorant savages. This realisation is a sobering experience, and provocative of that form of thought which founded on an impulse of doubt develops into an intense and hungry desire for rational truth. Grotesque religious myths, especially in regard to the creation of the world, were superseded by the massively moving splendour of an ordered drama, unfolding stage by stage the amazing story of protoplasmic life struggling into being and commencing the triumphant march of evolution. This conception of the world was completely rational and devoid of all tendencies toward blathering emotion; it was merely a process whereby nonsense was replaced by commonsense.

By far the most interesting, and possibly the most important anti-religious force now to enter the field of cultural battle, was psychology, the youngest of the sciences and therefore the deadliest. Its major task has been to investigate the fundamental causes of the religious illusion, and to explain our religious tendencies and prejudices in the light of analytical experiment. The ontological argument in support of the existence of God declared that humanity's tendency or desire to believe in a supreme deity was justification enough to believe in the latter's existence, for man, it was argued, cannot desire anything which does not exist and which cannot therefore be experienced. One of psychology's

first achievements was to nullify this falsity by explaining the precise nature of the impulse or desire toward belief in God. This psychology did by emphasising the mental continuity inherent in the development of man, as a corollary to the physical continuity established by Darwin. Environment as a formative force in the moulding of our character especially when as in our childhood we are susceptible to such influences, has been brought into proper perspective by the new theories of the religious illusion propounded by psychology. In curing the neurotic or the perverted delinquent recourse is made to psycho-analysis which seeks to analyse the roots of the patient's character and impulsive propensities—roots which are deeply imbedded in the person's unconscious and which are invariably the result of his or her childhood environment. Psychology has applied this method of inquiry to the investigation of the religious myth, the upshot of the experiment being the established and now widely accepted theory that human motivation is rooted in primitive instincts, and that humanity's yearning for a good God is but a developed form of childhood's natural inclination to seek security and love from an all-powerful and omniscient father. Society as an aggregate of persons so inclined has formulated for itself the comforting conception of an Almighty Father bearing close resemblances magnified and sanctified to any one of millions of earthly fathers.

Here we unavoidably touch upon one of the fundamental aspects of religion—its capacity as an emotional outlet. Religion as we understand it today, despite the straits to which it has been reduced by science, still continues to serve as a necessary emotional

neurosis of religion were to be dispelled, the masses, deprived of their emotional stability, their 'opiate', would erupt into individual cases of neurosis. The problem, as we shall see later, of religious reintegration is a complex and difficult one. Further interesting notes on psychological theories of the religious illusion, especially in regard to conscience and sex will be found in the appendix to which the reader is referred.

SUMMARY

A necessarily sketchy review of the failure of the orthodox religions has been attempted. The disintegration of religion has been emphasised as one of those major forces which in common with economic decay have produced the chaotic conditions of today. The disaster which religion has suffered in its struggle against the sciences, and the fact of its gradual alienation from the intelligent public and a proportionate inclination toward the favour of the governing classes, have spelled its absolute failure. It is conservative and static where it is required to be dynamic and progressive. It is more concerned to maintain an illusion and chaperon the interests of the governing classes, than to labour for the cause of the better life for the masses. If judgment be pronounced solely on the basis of what are known as the Christian ethics, religion has failed and failed damnably. Religion today is in the melting pot, but its essence remains. Before considering what we may make of this essence, it is essential that we give due attention to the consequences in society of the religious decline.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONSEQUENCES OF RELIGIOUS DECAY

WE are, as we have seen, in previous chapters, living in momentous times, for the economic and religious forces which have been driving society by their frictional impetus, have reached their climactic disintegration in our age. Society today—albeit unknowingly—is the greatest sufferer, for it has suddenly found it necessary to adjust itself to a totally new environment, yet this adjustment to changing conditions has been found difficult if not impossible, for society's relations with the past and the traditions of the past, are too intimate and of so long a standing that they are not easily abandoned. Alternatively, if the necessary adjustment is not established, the consequences are painful and alarming. Today, we are not even in the transition stage towards this complete readjustment; we have not realised that such a radical alteration is a necessity at all. Consequently we are not in harmony with our environment; we are bewildered and frustrated, unable to live the balanced and full life of personality which is the condition of any civilisation. The decay in religious belief has been chiefly responsible for the spiritual malaise from which society suffers today.

Looking over the ruins of the battlefield in the cold reflection of the aftermath, the scene of emotional wreckage entailed by the collapse of religion is so distressing that even scientists have paused in their indefatigable pursuit of truth, and admitted that the extent of emotional damage almost amounts to a prohibitive price for truth. Yet, truth cannot on this account, be discounted; for to the scientist, truth and truth alone is the only basis upon which a civilised society may be founded. He, therefore, feels that no justification or apology is required for the devastation which the sciences have caused in the structure of orthodox religion. A false ideology has been laid waste and man has attained a new dignity and nobility of thought in his intellectual gropings for the elusive meaning of all things. Nevertheless a price has been paid for this progress—a price which is intrinsically neither prohibitive nor heavy, if we would not make it so. Our inability or reluctance progressively to harmonise ourselves with our new environment has magnified the disasters of the Church out of all proportion. In the absence of any such harmonisation, the Church defeated and debunked continues to carry on as an anachronism constituting an irritating obstacle to those who are eager to make the necessary progressive readjustment of human living to new conditions. Society viewed as a whole presents a complexity of attitudes—here progressive, there retrogressive, here pro-religion, there rabidly revolutionary; it is a gigantic compromise between the requirements of the new order and those of the remaining traditions of the past. This lack of thoroughness, this gradual transformation of

one order into another is perhaps an evolutionary inevitability, for no society is absolutely static, though it may tend to be more or less static, according to its stage of development.

On the one side we have the spectacle of the masses, illiterate and yet vaguely conscious of the diminishing influence of orthodox religion in the organisation of their social life; these masses, as we have pointed out are emotionally unstable, and they are still dependent on religion for the emotional comfort and consolation which alone enable them to face the ruthless indifference of a material world with a certain assurance. Statistical inquiry has beyond doubt established the fact that belief in orthodox religious theories tends to be associated with a definite deficiency in intelligence and education. The ignorant continue therefore to be steeped in superstitious religion; the middle class educated are in a state of confused bewilderment giving rise to social symptoms which we shall examine later; the governing classes including most politicians tend in their own interests to be solemnly pious. They manifest this piety by invoking the Almighty whenever an opportunity presents itself, and by financing missionaries to the East to convert the heathen 'without the law'. It is perhaps not polite to point out that these same politicians and governing classes have the exploitation of Far East to thank for their wealth and position. Christianity preaching contentment is the opium with which they contrive to maintain the working masses in economic servitude. Since the middle of the nineteenth century however, there has been an increasing renaissance of human intelligence, an awakening of the spirit for the freedom of the intellect.

from the restrictive dogma of the past. This progressive attitude of mind was confined to a cultured group of men and women who, as artists, scientists, philosophers, writers and men of affairs have been from ten to a hundred years in intellectual advance of the masses. These men and women, leading lives of personality and cultural abundance, could well afford to renounce religion and yet maintain an emotional equipoise and an enriched philosophy of life. They and their kind are among the happiest class in the world.

It is the middle class educated however, who give evidence of the most astonishing social phenomena resulting as a direct consequence of the waning influence of religion as a moulding force in society. Social order and morality have suffered disintegration, and life has for the great majority been deprived of purpose and meaning. Vacillating loyalties, false gods, boredom, misuse of energy, fruitless conflicts and despair,—these are torturing a generation which has failed to readjust itself to a new and progressive world environment. Ours is an age of pain and distress, of despair and bitter disappointment—when ‘but to think is to be full of sorrow and leaden-eyed despairs’. Consider the economic strains of the working man exploited by an economic system which as we have seen in a previous chapter recognises no moral curbs whatever; consider the disintegration of the beautiful family union, the discords between children and their parents; consider the sharp anguish and recurring perplexity of the mother who feels that the religious habits she has taught her children have led them to cynicism and despair; consider the pitiful dilemma of the simple and devout man who finds the Church forsaken by those whom he

loves and respects; consider the fate of growing children bereft of a stable home background, and of a sound moral basis upon which their characters may develop; consider above all the fate of every man who when as never before he requires a firm, beautiful philosophy upon which to build amidst universal chaos, is confronted with gaping fissures in the rock of religion itself.

So absolute has been the collapse of religion as an integrating force in society that the moral and emotional curbs which had hitherto maintained a stable society, fell away with increasing rapidity. The consequent dislocation of a balanced and civilised life has been widespread and intense enough to alarm the social scientists who in pursuing their anti-religious campaign had never reckoned with such disastrous and painful consequences. Post-war problems in the era following the conclusion of the struggle between science and religion have recurred with increasingly malignant persistency. The intellectual and emotional maladjustment which has given rise to the mad delirium of neurotic behaviour throughout the world, is threatening civilisation with absolute retrogression and collapse. How imminent this threat is, and how urgent are the factors working towards this catastrophe, may be measured by the fact that the present war is a prelude to the climax of the post-war period when all that mankind has cherished and held dear may be lost, or if commonsense and the spirit of a virile democracy prevails, when mankind will forge ahead to a standard of civilisation and to a measure of happiness which 'eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive'.

C. E. M. Joad cites some very interesting figures to illustrate the decline in general church attendance—for this obviously is the first surface evidence to be noted in any society suffering as we are today from spiritual decline and malaise. Joad found in

1887 a congregation of 295 in an average London area; in 1903 a congregation of 184 and

in 1927 a congregation of 63. It has been discovered that between two consecutive years Sunday School attendance in Great Britain dropped by 100,000. Other inquiries of a similar nature conducted in both Britain and America indicate that there has been a slow but definite decline in religious belief and church attendance among the considerable numbers which constitute the educated middle class. With the exception of occasional revivals of religious fervour (usually only of local significance and due probably to some temporary force) there can be no doubt that the emancipation of the educated masses of the middle class from religious dogma has been steadily progressing.

Sociologists agree that there has never been a single general drift back to the Church since disintegration of religious dogma set in. At worst circumstances have arrested the decline, but a reversion has never been possible. As for the Church, as H. G. Wells observes 'the bishops, so much in evidence socially, are intellectually in hiding'. How is it then, it may be inquired, that the Church having been so soundly trounced, the disintegration of the religious myth and the proportionate spread of scientific ideas has been so gradual? This is a point which may profitably be considered later; sufficient is it for the present to point out that the masses have ever been

reluctant to welcome the new and to abandon the old and the familiar. They have manifested a hostility towards science surpassed only by that of the Church itself. They have clung to the old familiar past with all the dogmatic ignorance of a mentally perverted people. In the mass therefore, they constitute a social problem that may seriously impede the development of the progressive readjustment which mankind must evolve if the race is to gain a new harmony with its environment. They are tossed here, driven there, barely conscious of the economic and emotional forces that are driving them to some inconceivable diabolical end. In the midst of economic and cultural chaos they are inarticulate and helpless, leading an existence of continuous frustration. It is in perfection of this dismal picture that we find that despite an enormity of material wealth and an increasing comfort, the lives of men and women today are rarely happy.

The decline in church attendance in itself however may hardly be accounted a regrettable social phenomena; more pernicious forms of the disease, in subtle subversive permeation of the whole social structure, gradually sapped it of its strength until the slightest pressure upon it of a new social force such as a prolonged war would spell disaster. The Church as an agent of moral stability has found all its attempts at such leadership abortive; delinquent and unsocial behaviour has increased with alarming rapidity as moral curbs fell away. More emphasis has been laid on economic and material values than on spiritual ones (which for the masses is a desirable consequence of religious decline). The ignorant masses flock to the Church for consolation and not for guidance; they

find inspiration in the Sunday papers. The rest do not flock at all.....

Bereft of any emotional outlet, and frustrated without any apparent purpose in life, and their faces being relentlessly ground by a dastardly economic system, they accepted without question or cautious scepticism institutions and movements which afford them an outlet for their impulses of super-personal loyalties. It is the very natural human desire to 'belong', to feel that one is harmoniously united within a certain group working for a certain end, and promising each member certain securities and advantages such as employment and higher standards of living and peace. One such movement in its most malignant form is that of the Nazis today. As may have been discerned by the reader in the previous chapters on the economic decay, the Nazis did not introduce centralised State control over the business life in Germany; they found such centralisation largely in being. Thoroughly defeated and humiliated in 1918, Germany re-entered the vicious capitalist scramble at a serious disadvantage; she was very short of capital and faced everywhere by an increasing number of tariff walls. In these circumstances the German economic system passed into State control which when the Nazis came to power was subsequently subordinated to their own ends. The Nazis struck a bargain with German capitalists who feared a revolutionary movement among the proletariat. Socialism and trade unionism were gaining ground, and the capitalists had no alternative but to agree to the Nazi terms, according to which the Nazis would suppress Socialism and Trade Unionism, ensure a supply of docile labour

at cheap wages, while the capitalist were to produce and invest proceeds under conditions approved by the state. It will be seen from this that Nazism was *not* an offensive obstruction of world forces, arising from a void. It is an integral part of the world forces combination which by their aggregate impetus is carrying humanity to retrogressive catastrophe.

If then, the Nazis found economic conditions in Germany during the post-1918 period suitable for adaptation to the Nazi doctrine, they found a similar open field in the cultural field. The Germans had suffered a slighting humiliation; they had been economically warped; they, like the rest of world civilisation, were suffering from the emotional unrest of religious decline; they could conceive no truly satisfying aim in life; they lost hope and in 1930 when Germany's economic basis crumbled, they plunged into despair. They sought no utopia, no peace, no common prosperity, no liberty, no equality, no fraternity; what were these but mere blah-blahing words to a people slighted and hounded like the veriest criminal. They set up an unconscious cry for security and order and national respect; the capitalist economic system had thrown out an increasing number of young men into the streets unemployed. The stage was set for Nazism; when the curtain went up Nazism was there.

Nazism afforded them an emotional outlet, it promised them security and employment, it gave them national respect, it gave them a sense of solidarity and power, it promised the working classes work, and the capitalists cheap labour, it provided social

services such as recreation, travel and education, it rescued the German working man from feeling isolated and neglected, it provided parks and rest centres..... All this, as a means not to democracy, but to Nazified world domination. The Nazis have set about their task with a clear-cut purpose—world domination; they do not care to disguise this fact. We are supposed to have a clear-cut purpose; yet we are mentally so cluttered up with the conservative restrictiveness of the old order which we simply will not abandon, that in fighting Nazism we are not one whit nearer to achieving that democracy of liberty, equality, and fraternity that is vaunted to the skies in our propaganda.

However enough has been said to illustrate how smoothly and with an air of natural consequence, such a pernicious doctrine as Nazism follows in the train of events, when mankind hesitates between the absolute abandonment of the old order and the bold endeavour to achieve a vital democracy. The fact then that in abandoning religion the masses have found a new loyalty in movements such as Nazism, must not be interpreted to advocate a return to orthodox a religion or that we deplore the victory of science over the religious myth. What is to be deplored is the inability of mankind to follow up the lead of science, to relinquish the old order for good and all, and to evolve in the attempt to achieve a virile and genuine democracy an emotional outlet and stability which will harness the bewildered masses into the campaign for democracy. For the social means which the Nazis have used to further their Nazi ends, are the very means which must be utilised for the laying of the foundations of

turns Nazi and fanatic. The middle class well-to-do, or the majority of them, continue in those countries which profess democracy, to lead this vegetable existence with the absolute abandon. They have evolved a 'democratic' way of life which we prefer to describe as 'democratic decadence'.

If the decline in religious belief, as the root cause, has caused such offensive social phenomena, the decadent, purposeless living of the majority of the middle and upper classes, has in its turn done much to sap the social structure of its energy and strength. We would indeed make the distinction that such as these exist and do not live. They exist in a vortex of a maniacal hunt for pleasure, and their passions are speed, cocktails and jazz. It is neither exaggeration nor melodrama to point out that the chronic symptoms of sensual preoccupation from which the larger part of the population suffers today, are symptoms not of progress, nor of democracy, nor of stability, nor of self-respect, but of shameless decadence. Philosophers and social scientists have not for nothing pointed out that the hectic emotional unrest among the population bears striking resemblances to the spirit of the Romans during the period immediately preceding the fall of their Empire. Warnings have been issued, but the insane campaign of fast pleasure-existence continues and apparently will never abate until positive attempts are made to check it. It is, like an economic force, impossible to check completely, but it may be deflected and its effects minimised. This is not pessimism; it is the world scene as it reveals itself to any intelligent observer.

Consider the statement of an Eastern philosopher, 'Yes, you know how to fly in the air like birds, and

stomach-and-pocket outlook upon life. Our delight in speed merely for its sake is the delight of the cannibal overjoyed at the ticking of a tin watch; we roar through the streets, letting the old bus 'rip'—a menace to pedestrians and a general nuisance to others—so that we might lounge into the club bar ten minutes earlier, so that we might expend these precious ten minutes in the guzzling down of filthy liquor or in turning over the pages of a magazine printed in large type and containing pictures on every page—photographs of stage and movie stars, of social celebrities...and so on ad nauseam.....

Our literature, as one commentator put it is 'neurotic, erotic and tommyrotic'. It is not striving after effect, when we declare most definitely, that not a few of our generation would prefer to be found intoxicated rather than be discovered reading Shakespeare or Lamb's essays. Such reading matter are in hiding under the cushion, while the latest issue of the sporting paper or the *Illustrated Gossip* takes pride of place on the modern reading table. We are being dominated by the tyranny of 'lowbrowism', for society today exists in perfect horror of the stigma of being called 'high-brow'. To put it plainly, our age is such, that to prefer the best is a matter of shame, and to figure in a nice juicy scandal a matter of unspoken congratulation. No worse insult is conceivable than that of being called high-brow, and it is painful to note how embarrassed the average man or woman is when through some inadvertent slip in the conspiracy of secrecy, he or she is forced to confess preferences which are 'high-brow' or 'intellectual' or as the scoffing low-brow says 'beyond me'.

ing-room chatter. This explanation is extremely illuminating for by its light several remarkable social conventions of today become steadily intelligible. For instance, there is the unwritten social law that a conversation of inane tit-bits is preferably conducted against a background of noise poured out by the radio to which no one actually *listens*. Modern society cannot tolerate silence. *Ergo*, they switch on the radio to fill up pauses between the bright loquaciousness of drawing-rooms. A road-drill or an air-raid siren or uncle blowing his nose, would do just as well, without using the name of music in vain. Blowing noses and sounding sirens and road-drills are less obscenely vulgar than the hideous sensuality of jazz.

In regard to what passes as dancing today, I will recapitulate a paragraph written previously on the subject. There is no reason why we should expand on the topic, beyond establishing the fact that the influence of social and religious disintegration upon our social structure has been disastrously great. Here is the paragraph:

Consider that form of primitive orgy known as the jitterbug, which emanating in America—that land of extreme vulgarity—has now spread like an eruptive disease throughout the English speaking world. It is damnable, disgusting, revolting, sickening, repulsive, loathsome, retrogressive—and something worse. It is an open rebellion against every canon of good taste and a shocking manifestation on the depth of shaming decadence to which the present generation has descended. Except for the Nazis who have discovered an emotional stability for themselves in their movement, the rest of the world, and especially the democracies, are in a

state of vacillating abandon. It is interesting to note here, incidentally, that German music by its richer tonal quality and by its invariably classic origin, presents an illuminating contrast to the froth of jazzy nonsense churned out by the B.B.C. The former is indicative of a sound and settled outlook upon life, there is a philosophic calm and assurance and also a certain zest in the life of the sincere Nazi, perverted lunatic though he is. The jazz provides a clue to the spiritual decadence of the 'democracies' for the proportion in which this nausea is poured out is remarkably greater than the proportion of semi-classical, classical or unjazz popular music that is doled out to the B.B.C. public. German music is incomparably finer in its strength, the beauty of its texture, and in its clean-cut massive solidarity, and we may admit this, that the Nazi creed has at least given them a valuable sense of purpose into which the Germans may expend their emotional energy.

In the years of the grace and majesty of the nineteenth century, when the man in the street loved to listen to proud, rolling cadences of Offenbach and Sullivan, there was a certain dignity, and stateliness and grace and stability which the 'democracies' enjoyed. Economic and social disintegration had not then advanced far enough to affect the basis of individual life; he still retained a certain dignity proper to a man, a dignity symbolic of an age of spiritual stability, peace and culture and refinement.

The cankerous decay which has been sapping the social structure of its strength, has resulted today in an almost revolutionary deterioration in the standard of spiritual and intellectual life. There being no ideal or

purpose by the guidance of which the individual might conduct his or her life, the only satisfying alternative of a moderately well-to-do democratic population was to lead a worldly life of vapid pleasures. Heavenly rewards and infernal punishments being outmoded fairytales, and seeing no reason whatever for the abstinence that morality bids them observe, they prefer the wine and kisses to the vague promises of compensation in a future world. They do not even recognise the necessity of trying to maintain an emotional balance with their environment, and of readjusting themselves to the new world conditions which the disintegration of the old order and the progress of science have brought about. They are born with jazz in their ears, and cocktail traversing their throats; they exist and then they die. That is all that there is to their lives. A mere vegetable existence. To those who are not of the leisured classes a demoralising factor is the constant threat of war and war itself. Seeing no prospect of employment, and no prospect of peace, here again they unanimously take to wine and kisses and jazz—the ‘opiate of the masses’ modern version. A few intellectuals have judiciously selected communism as a channel into which they might sublimate their emotional energies, but the creed has grown so conventionally insipid that it leaves the majority of its erstwhile supporters coldly discontent and dissatisfied.

The victorious scientist surveying the ruins of the orthodox church, contemplates a painful tragedy of disillusionment and warped lives. He rightly consoles himself of the righteousness of his victory, for whatever the price, truth can never be bought at too great a cost. But he realises the urgent need of a vast readjustment of

the lives of modern men and women to new conditions that the evolutionary process has thrown up into prominence in our age. Without standards in morals, without beliefs in religion, without convictions in politics, without values in art, there are few or possibly no periods in history which present so barren and bleak and demoralising an outlook as our own brave wonderful age. Our 'democratic' generation is bored, dangerously bored, existing on an interim basis, keeping themselves reasonably sane by the collective opiate of jazz, liquor and an unending hunt for pleasure. Dean Inge has described them 'the largest and most irresponsible leisure class the world has ever seen'.

Those who, by temperamental make-up, are least able to accept the fast tempo of the modern pleasure-life unconsciously develop neurotic symptoms and mental disorders. This is especially the case in the United States of America where the annual increase in mental patients is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Similarly the suicide rate in Germany among those who have psychologically and emotionally failed to adjust themselves to the Nazi doctrine, has lately been rising at a prodigious speed. The war has, of course, provided an outlet for the emotional energy of all nations; intense nationalism therefore is a perfectly understandable feature of our age. We are consoling ourselves in the bloodpaths and suffering which the present war has brought mankind; at last mankind, and especially youths have a purpose, for the duration at least,—to slaughter as many of the enemy as possible. Society recognises such achievements with medals and flattering obituary notices..... When their old pagan gods gradually declined in power, the Romans throughout their Empire

became sick through a surfeit of unexpended emotion. As Chesterton wrote 'All round the circle of the Mediterranean cities, the people mourned for the loss of gods and were consoled with gladiators'. During the intermining centuries mankind has in a lesser or greater degree continued to suffer from an unstable and undisciplined life, pathetically creating makeshift devices into which it might expend the energy which it would fain use for the achievement of a better life.

It is only after the emotional basis of religion as a stabilising force in society, has been suddenly removed that we realise the extent to which we have been indebted to it for an ordered civilisation. But as we have seen religion is not merely an outlet for society's unexpended emotional energy; it must and should be progressive if it is to do justice to the role to which it is assigned in a virile democracy. It must be dynamic not static; it must be free of all dogma and fantastic biblical fairy tales arising from mystic antiquity; it must adapt the virile progressive vigour of science, and endeavour to meet the requirements of a society which is working for an ultimate democracy. Religion's failure in all these respects, and especially its cussed alliance with the governing classes, whose interests it has elected to protect, has caused her alienation from the masses. As a prominent man of the Church pointed out, people no more came to the Church for guidance and inspiration, but for consolation. Its final degradation has been to do duty as a drug.

And no world order, no country, no society, no civilisation can continue to function in harmony with its environment if the sole source of its inspiration is a

mere drug. A violent break from this vicious habit, a whole-hearted attempt of all co-operative civilised humanity to begin anew, to try democracy again on fresh foundations,—such a clear-cut emphatic realisation which every intelligent citizen of the world should regard as a challenge to him and his kind, is an overwhelming necessity. Only the vigour and determination arising from such a realisation, will generate the spirit that will subsequently lead mankind to a sincere attempt to attain the long hoped-for Utopia.

In bringing this chapter to a close, due mention must be made not of the Church as an official body, but of the individual priests and clergymen who have gone about the world at the cost of manifold personal sacrifices and hardships, preaching not so much Christianity as a way of life based on the principles of the Christian ethics—a life of love and charity. Most of these clergymen are men of culture and personality, and if driven to it, would admit that they have, like the scientist, thrown aboard orthodox religious dogma in their heart of hearts. But unlike the scientist, they continue to interest themselves in the welfare of the bewildered human suddenly deprived of his religion. They comfort the individual and help him to tide over his emotional crises invoking the help not of the organised Church, but directly of the personality of Christ. These good and true men are interested more in the individual and his spiritual difficulties, than in society and its religious problems. They are cultured and refined men with a rich and abundant philosophy that cannot but comfort and calm the troubled soul.....In this hour of crisis and disillusionment, these men are not men of the Church but

men of wisdom to whom the sick in spirit flock for consolation and guidance. The Church has collapsed, but the warm philosophy of human consolation continues to act as a palliative—an uncertain palliative.

SUMMARY.

On the whole this chapter has been a dreary survey, yet a most important and inevitable one, for it serves as an unifying factor in the picture we have been painting of the forces which are carrying mankind and civilisation at an increasing tempo, toward the ultimate catastrophe of oblivion and retrogression. We have seen that however mighty and seemingly impersonal implacable economic and religious forces are, in their ultimate causation they affect the very core of our individual lives. Failing discipline and an united effort to achieve better things, we are driven helplessly along by the vast tide of these aggregate forces, disintegrating the social structure and the foundations of civilisation with all the massive continuity and finality of the evolutionary process. The effects of religious decay, as a corollary to the ills and shortcomings of the dastardly economic system described in preceding chapters, have been most distressing in terms of individual happiness and emotional stability. Science indeed has been quick to blaze the way to a new and better world, but for reasons which will be studied later, humanity has failed to readjust itself speedily enough or sufficiently enough to achieve the harmony and peace of a society in tune with its environment. The nature of this new environment and our adjustment to it,

both economic and religious are matters requiring adequate consideration in the following sections.

We would reiterate however, on the plea that its importance justifies its recapitulation, that unless 'democratic' society abandons the decadent purposeless life it has for so long been accustomed to live, the enemies of democracy one of whom we are fighting now, will force us to abandon it and subject us to a discipline of slavery and bondage. Our enemies are tough and disciplined; we must be tougher and more disciplined, for it is not only that we have not achieved democracy but that our society has produced soppy youths who will utterly be incapable of defending the democracy which may possibly arise from the ruins of the present war. If anything, the bitter lesson of this century is the fact that democracy or the simulacrum of it as we have achieved, cannot thrive on radio romances, jitterbugs, swilling liquor, kisses and jazz.

CHAPTER SIX

OUR WAR AIMS

MUCH has been said and written about our war aims, but the diversity of such statements has been so great, and the lack of unanimity so obvious, that it is never redundant to try and clarify the issues involved in this war against Nazi-Fascism. Indeed, this clarification of war issues is a matter of the most profound importance. The inordinate confusion and fuss that have been evoked in regard to what are precisely and what are not our war aims, should not therefore deter us from taking up the study of this aspect of the war in the light of what has been disclosed in the preceding chapters. In spite of the fact that thousands of words have been expended on the question, the United Nations still continue their struggle against the enemies of democracy, blissfully ignorant of or indifferent to post-war aims, beyond that of defeating the enemy on the field of battle. We have all too often taken refuge behind the convenient assertion that we are fighting for the twin sisters, liberty, fraternity and equality; or again we are told every time a diplomat opens his mouth that democracy is at stake and that we are fighting to preserve this form of government. Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt met in the middle of the Atlantic and produced a brain-child in the form of the Atlantic Charter—a mental pabulum

which Roosevelt declared was applicable to all men, and which Mr. Churchill declared was not applicable to India. Where are we? What are we fighting for? For Poland, for Greece, for England, for democracy, for civilisation, for liberty, for peace, for the Atlantic Charter—are we fighting for all these or any selection of them?

The futility of these words, mere words and Charters, is obvious. At the best they are an enunciation of principles and ideals, and though of intrinsic value, they are in a warring world of no practical importance,—*unless and until they are made the basis of a definite plan*. This is a war of ideas, of plans and of ideologies, a war in which both belligerents hold certain plans for the reconstruction of the post-war world and the establishment of new orders for humanity and civilisation. Upon the outcome of the war will be decided which of these plans will ultimately prove effective. It may be thought presumptuous on my part to declare that we do have a plan; the fact is, we have, but we have so far failed to declare them clearly and convincingly enough. And when I say we have a plan, I mean a plan not on paper, nor necessarily that it has been approved or recognised by the Foreign Office. I mean a plan that is in the heart of every soldier, sailor and airman who are fighting this war for us, on the land, on the sea and in the air. These men realise first that they are fighting for their home and beloved ones, secondly that they are fighting for their homeland; and thirdly that they are fighting for the opportunity and the right to rebuild a new world shorn of the economic and social ills that made existence in the pre-war period a nightmare of worries and disillusionments.

Platitudes about our fighting for 'democracy' and 'liberty' are received with cold hostility by these men; they have heard these idealistic circumlocutions before, until they have learned to regard them with derisive cynicism. Whether they are aware of the fact or not, they were for long subjected to the abuses of the disintegrating economic and cultural systems surveyed in the earlier portions of this work. They feel instinctively, that the present war is unlike the last Great War, in that the fundamental issues at stake are more clearly evident to the common man in the street. It comes home to his bosom and business, it is a matter about which he feels strongly, it is a matter about which he will not be satisfied by the soothing hypocritical platitudes of politicians. The public, especially that portion of it that is in khaki, is not a gullible congeries of credulous simpletons. Gradually but implacably evolutionary history is revealing before our eyes the profundity of the truth that you cannot fool all the people all the time.

The war especially has, more than any former education, provoked the masses to the realisation that until they reassert their inalienable right to demand the establishment of a progressive new order in the post-war world, there are powerful forces which will by every means, try to oppose such progress and maintain or revert to the old, old, order of things with its abominable economic and social ills. The intelligent man of the average class, if he were to put his war aims into words would say, 'After this war is over I want the opportunity to live a reasonably secure and full life; the opportunity to contribute

from whatever capacities I have to the common store, and to receive, in return, the benefits of the capacities of others. In a word I want Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness.' These aims are fundamental to every man thoughtful enough and sincere enough to appreciate the full implications of the present war. But are these fundamental aims embodied in any declaration of war policy sanctioned by authority? Has any definite plan been evolved for the reconstruction of the world on lines which would facilitate the achievement of a progressive and virile democracy?

When in 1939 Britain declared war on Germany, it was presumably to restore the independence of Czechoslovakia and Poland; it was openly and commonly declared that the intimidation of nation to nation and the threat of insecurity engendered by Hitler's terroristic methods could not be tolerated by the world comity of nations. *Ergo* Germany must be destroyed. Boundaries must be readjusted and national sovereignties re-established, and peace would then be ensured. The root causes of the war and the pressing need of a fundamental readjustment of human society, was not as generally recognised as they are now; it was not until the struggle had developed literally into a world war that men's minds were awakened, partly by the intense ideological propaganda campaign and partly by the extensive demoralising influence of the war, to the fact that a world revolution was in being. The old order was collapsing like a sand castle before the incoming tide, and nations were frantically engaged in giving birth to ideologies and makeshift devices with which to

tide themselves over till such time when they would be free to establish a stabilised order. It was not till then that the masses of intelligent citizens became aware that the struggle against Nazism was not only one in which vital issues were at stake but one which clearly afforded mankind the opportunity to break with the old order and forge ahead to the formation of a new, genuine democracy—a democracy which they had for so long been denied. The awakening therefore among the intelligent sections of the public has been certain, but the awakening as such has been of little practical significance, for in the absence of any realistic leadership, the masses have been unable to bring their aggregate influence to bear upon those who are responsible for the affairs of state. Social inertia and inability to grasp the urgency of the situation have considerably retarded this natural tendency or inherent impetus toward the realisation of an improved standard of living within a society. There are, as we have seen in previous chapters, not a few elements in society in whose interest it is to obstruct any such progressive tendency and to maintain the *status quo* irrespective of the dictates of reason and justice. These considerations then amply illustrate the necessity of postulating two distinct sets of war aims—those set forward and recognised by progressive intellectuals supported by an undefinable mass of men and women of average intelligence, and those recognised and publicised by authority. We will proceed to examine both.

The conception of the full life, the life of personality and culture brought about on a basis of liberty, equality of opportunity, and fraternity, has been an integral part of the intellectual content of

European civilisation. Though it has never been realised in practice, and though it has seldom been made the ultimate purpose of a practical plan, some credit does accrue to the democracies in the fact that they have valued in theory the conception of a full life which is both a condition and the end-result of a virile democracy. It is rooted in Western Mediterranean culture and finds its inspiration in what may be termed the Christian conception of the individual, and its negation in the totalitarian denial of the value of the individual except in so far as the latter finds expression through the medium of the State. Whatever may have happened to its dogma, the Christian philosophy of life holds that in the sight of God, all individual souls of both sexes, all nations and ranks, are equal in their value and their right to the realisation of the full life. This doctrine of the individual personality as an end in itself, has never been explicitly repudiated except in our age by Nazism and its satellites. 'The individual,' Hitler has written, 'has no rights apart from his function as part of the state.' This open and terse repudiation places Nazism in an unequivocal position; its renunciation of the Christian doctrine is absolute, and its subordination of the individual to the dictates of the state is a direct divergence both in theory and practice, from the essential principle of European culture. The 'democracies' have theoretically faithfully observed the rights of the individual, as exemplified in the Christian doctrine, but the economic and social imbroglio surveyed in the preceding chapters suggests that unlike the Nazis we have not repudiated the fundamental precepts of democracy, but that we have

conveniently ignored them. We need not recapitulate here the innumerable social and economic inequalities and abuses which characterised the old order, and which gave rise to those very conditions that subsequently facilitated the present war. We are quite familiar with these facts, especially because politicians continue to pay them a lip-recognition that is as tiresome as it is nauseating. The consolation that the recognition at least is made, is premature, for such a recognition (when politicians glibly orate on the ills of the new order and the desirability of establishing a new one) is nothing more than an expediency devised for the moment. They have with experienced skill gauged the mood of the public, but have erred in believing that the latter is gullible enough to accept the vague and nebulous windy oratory of a new world to come as a complete assurance of the fact that a sincere attempt toward the achievement of a virile democracy is to be made.

It will be noted that the one war aim embracing all that we have considered so far is that of a new world order. Nothing short of this can possibly suffice, if mankind is to live in a progressive peace in which a higher civilisation may be attained. The tendency to compromise, to not go 'as far as that', though a genial and human one, is inimical to any post-war reconstruction, for as the very fact of war clearly illustrates, the social and economic disease is so virulent in form that vigorous methods are called for in combating it successfully. Ruthless radicalism and a steadfast determination coupled with a knowledgeable grasp of the fundamental necessities of the new order, ^{and} individual attributes which must be cultivated, ~~for~~ ^{and}

this cannot be over-emphasized—in spite of the disintegration that the old order has suffered, there are forces today working for its restoration in the post-war world. These are forces which, like social inertia, must be courageously faced and effectively counter-acted.

The issues before us are clear and definite; either we are for a new democratic order or we ally ourselves directly or indirectly with those anti-democratic forces with which we are engaged in war. In opposing the Nazi-Fascists, we are obviously denying them the right to impose their order upon the chaotic post-war world; but no war is fought purely on the basis of a negative inspiration. What we lack is an affirmative note, a new order of our own to combat the Nazi order on its own ground. The Nazis, as we have noted in a different text are a peoples in despair; they have been driven to the demoralising conclusion that a democratic order which in its perfection and realisation is almost idealistic, is unachievable. They are the most pernicious forms of mental disorder thrown up into an unsuspecting world by the old order. In so far as Nazism, as a disagreeable excrescence of conditions prevalent in pre-war days, is a doctrine of despair, it must for humanity's sake be suppressed. We have been engaged in this suppression for three years, yet have we evolved any semblance of a specific plan for a new happier democratic world to present to the common man in the street with the injunction that here is something worth fighting for, something in which he may sublimate all his emotional and intellectual energies, something in which he may fling

himself with the spirited determination of those who fight for a supreme cause.....

The economic and social shortcomings studied in preceding sections, constitute a direct challenge to civilised mankind in the form of a mute cry, as it were, for rectification. Yet obvious and urgently necessary as such a readjustment is, no politician or political party has, beyond the limits of the traditional lip-service which the public has learned to discount, formulated any scheme of a new order of progressive democracy to which the public would respond with enthusiasm and spirit. The Sankey Declaration of the Rights of Man is a classic manifestation of the direction in which the intelligent public mind is tending, yet the remarkable fact has to be noted that no Government, no political party, no organisation or personage in the non-totalitarian world has subscribed to it without reservations and evasions. Even more remarkable is the absence of any outright refusal to recognise the democratic spirit as exemplified in the Declaration. Why then is not full official sanction and support not forthcoming? The Declaration is so obviously democratic and so completely consonant with the rooted traditional principles of Christian culture that authority cannot dare to repudiate it, for by so doing they automatically identify themselves as no better than the Nazis. They therefore continue to pay vague lip-service to democratic ideals and principles while shunning all detailed declarations and plans to which they will not commit themselves however democratic they might be. This facile hypocrisy, this damnable betrayal, this guilty reluctance to give open evidence of government's

alliance with the campaign for democracy, justifies to a certain extent Goebbels' gibe at the good faith of the pious pluto-democracies.

If we are to accept the public statements of politicians in good faith, then palpably we are not fighting for Britain's colonies nor for the continuance of her dominance over India, nor for her command of the sea, nor for her right to rule one quarter of the earth's surface and one quarter of the earth's inhabitants. In a word, our own intelligence, if not the politicians have shown indisputably that this is not a war of imperialism. What then is it? It is, as we have seen in the earlier sections of this book, a war for the opportunity to try democracy again, a democracy based on a new economic and social order. Cynicism and despair are inimical to constructive effort; we therefore suppress Nazism. When once Nazism has been abolished it should be no assumption that a progressive attempt will be made to establish the foundations of democracy throughout the world. That, undoubtedly, is the only alternative to an imperialist war. If imperialism has been denied, how then is it that a democratic plan for a new order has not received official sanction? How is it that the United Nations are given no such substantial war aim, nothing for which the commoners in his millions may fight with the fanatical spirit and determination of the Russian peasant? However we may seek to evade the answer, there is no alternative but to face the fact that **POWERFUL UNDEMOCRATIC FORCES EXIST** nationally and internationally in every country. Unless and until these forces are effectively counteracted, our politicians will continue to pay homage at the shrine of democratic ideals, while evading any practical

allegiance to the true democratic cause.

A firm and unequivocal declaration of a democratic war aims plan would

- (a) Unite the so-called 'united' nations.
- (b) Infuse spirit into the millions who fight for the democratic cause.
- (c) Gain the favour of nations remaining neutral.
- (d) Confound our enemies who believe us to be hypocrites.
- (e) Provide our propaganda machine with some grist to grind on.

Such a declaration serves two major purposes, affording first, a weapon of ideas with which to achieve military victory, and secondly a basic foundation upon which the new democratic order may be evolved. Of these the latter is manifestly of the greatest importance, especially so because the gnawing anxiety and urgency of the required readjustment cannot be over-emphasised. The mental readjustment and the basic foundations of the new democratic order must be evolved now, and applied even while the war is being waged, so that in the post-war period the cause of democracy may be strongly championed against powerful reactionary movements. Some semblance of unity and emotional stability is being maintained by the war, affording as it does an outlet for economic, industrial and emotional energy. If the increasing tempo of war were to cease abruptly, the disastrous consequence may well be imagined. It is precisely to minimise this chaos and to exploit for democratic purposes the opportunity thus afforded, that we stress the desirability of preparing our minds and plans now.

That the old order will never be re-established even in a severely attenuated form, and that the disintegration of the economic and social orders absolute, is a false contention calculated to invite complacency. A new democratic order will not blossom into fruition out of an undefinable void, requiring no constructive effort and discipline on the part of mankind. Democracy, as we have pointed out in the first chapter is so splendid and rare an achievement that nothing short of a determined and united effort launched now can ever prove effective. Her case must be vigorously championed or an anti-democratic force such as Fascism may prevail even though a military victory may have been achieved. This precisely is the outlook for the intelligent progressive masses.

Those of our leaders who are in positions of privilege and power, are thoroughly impervious to the conception of a new democratic order; they are mentally incapable of grasping this revolutionary conception, and blithely continue like a hutchful of munching rabbits to assume that there is nothing wrong with the dear old dead past to which they will contrive to revert if they are given the opportunity to do so. Nazism has destroyed their equanimity. *Ergo* Germany must be defeated, soundly thrashed, completely disarmed and trisected in a manner to be deliberated upon at the Peace Conference. Then they will be at peace to return to their old arm chair... Their peculiar mentality which is a powerful resistant to the formation of the new democracy, will be expanded upon later when we consider in detail those specific forces which any progressive democratic force must combat if it is to gain headway. For the present it is sufficient

to establish that our political leaders are yet the pawns of the British diehard oligarchy whose one single and steadfast purpose is to perpetuate the ills from which our generation has been suffering for so long. When the Nazis came to power and they gained the co-operation of the German capitalists by a definite guarantee to stave off revolution, suppress trade unions, and abolish communism, the English ruling classes clapped with approval. Hitler's propaganda machine assured the capitalist world in America and Britain that Nazi war preparations were solely directed against the Russian monster. Statesmen faithfully echoed their oligarchic ruling class whose henchmen they were by crying 'appeasement' and 'peace in our time' flavoured by pious declarations to the effect that their sole desire was to maintain peace and perpetuate a Christian democracy. Every manner of political subterfuge and incitement was used to turn the Nazis eastward. When the Nazis turned westward, they were overnight 'the forces of barbarism' and those dirty Bolsheviki became 'our gallant Russian allies'. Could there be anything more fantastically unreal and disgustingly insincere? Democracy then, was not at stake (there was no democracy to speak of), nor was the Empire, nor freedom or equality or fraternity (for these did not exist), nor peace for where there is no democracy there is no peace; what then was at stake? What compelled the narrow-minded, ignorant, cunning and inordinately vain Chamberlain to fly to Munich—to save what? Echo answers and history proves, the British oligarchy. They are consumed with fear of a new world order in which they will be deprived of their luxuries and

privileges and power. They realise that they cannot adapt themselves to the conditions that will prevail in the new democratic order; they realise that they will like the dodos eventually suffer extinction because they cannot readjust themselves to the new environment. They still retain considerable power and they may yet succeed in prolonging the last declining years of the old order, but this consideration, far from assuming their ultimate extinction, should provoke us to a firm and determined attempt to expropriate them by vigorously championing the true cause of democracy. These human dodos cannot survive but before they expire, they are capable of holding up mankind's advance just long enough for a new form of Fascism to come into being and threaten democratic civilisation again.

The democratic case must therefore be pressed forward now, plans must be formulated now, a new democratic education must be evolved now, and all those revolutionary forces working against the old order for the establishment of a new post-war democracy must unite into one international body—now. Failure thus to achieve a united body advocating the new democracy, is to weaken ourselves in the face of those oligarchic elements which are diabolically able in the protection of their own vested interests. The exigencies of the war have subjected them to a certain degree of socialistic inconvenience, but they have tolerated such inconvenience realising that there is much at stake at the conclusion of the war, and that if they can ensure power and dominance precisely at that psychological moment, they will be able to stage a capitalist come-back. They

will then solemnly convene a Peace Conference, mutilate the map of Europe into jigsaw sections of quibbling nationalist states, all prepared to resort to violence and war in twenty-five years, possibly over a strip of territory or an obscure valley about which there is a dispute. The Versailles of 1918 has given us a chronic headache; another Versailles would be suicidal. Yet, those politicians in whose hands our welfare is supposed to rest, have given no evidence of their awareness of this fact; in so far as they have given any evidence of their real desires, it would appear that they intend to maintain the undemocratic *status quo*. They are in point of fact doing everything possible to justify Goebbels' gibe 'pluto-democracy', and providing Nazi propagandists with arguments against 'democracy' which cannot be effectively counteracted except by some such formulation and declaration of a new democratic plan for the post-war world, which we have mentioned. They are, denying the common man in khaki the just cause of democracy for which he may fight with spirit and determination; they are cultivating a suspicious hostility among neutral minds; they are by their outrageous conduct delighting, not confounding, our enemies; and they have deprived our propaganda machine of any sense of purpose, reducing it to an aimless saga devoid of meaning and inspiration.

In the chaotic warring world of today, there is little to spare of good faith. Trust indeed is a word at which no politician will sniff; like Nelson he lifts the telescope to the blind eye and assumes that there is no such thing as trust. Yet we expect the world's masses to fight for the cause of the United Nations

(whatever that might be) simply on trust. This simply will not do; the world is not in the mood for trust. Its natural attitude of mind is one of suspicion. Yet in the absence of any definite declaration of a democratic war aims plan and if possible a no less definite concrete proof of our sincerity, we continue to expect them to espouse our cause against that of the Nazi. The situation is idiotic and illogical. A democratic campaign, if it is to succeed, must gain the whole-hearted co-operation and support of the PEOPLE everywhere. Only their spirit, their effort, their desires, their direction, can circumvent the obstacles that lie on the path to democratic realisation. What has been done or is being done to gain their support? Indeed it is more pertinent to ask what has been done to alienate them, to sow the seeds of suspicion, and of discontent. Political clap-trap has it that we are fighting for democracy; if so, we are fighting for something that does not exist. Beyond the common desire to annihilate Nazism, there is an absolute void from which to draw our inspiration, no common purpose or cause which whips us into the steely, fanatical determination and spirit of the Russian peasant...The dread still lingers, justified or unjustified, that millions are paying in flesh and blood, solely for the purpose of saving the British oligarchy and its foreign counter-parts from absolute extinction. So long as this unexpressed dread exists the whip-lash of our offensive against the Nazi-Fascists hardly ever stings.

It is an ironically tragic yet not forlorn picture that we contemplate. On the one side is the oligarchy which will never voluntarily part with power or

privilege; which contrives by every means in its power to maintain the *status quo* and to perpetuate it in the post-war world; which fears to commit itself to any new democratic plan, realising that the old order to which it would revert is incompatible with democracy. It bids its political henchmen to assuage the masses by doling out clap-trap about democratic liberty; it bids the Church to preach contentment, for is not peace and paradise and prosperity to be had in the spiritual world to come? When Germany rearmed, when Manchukuo fell, when Spain revolted, when Abyssinia struggled against the Italian jackal, the oligarchy cried 'appeasement' and 'peace in our time'. It was so well inured to the shell of its complacency that it failed to divine the threat of Nazi-Fascism; even now while we are in theory engaged in a war for democracy, it seeks to establish a capitalist restoration in post-war Europe.

The reverse side of the picture is distinctly more heartening, for the consciousness of the need of a new democratic order is steadily expanding among the intelligent masses, until the time may not be far distant when a united demand from them will bring down the last ramparts off the old order to absolute disintegration. It will be noted that the unconscious tendencies and desires of the people are in direct line of development of the economic and social conditions studied in the previous chapters. The masses are gripped by an insurgent desire to better themselves, to achieve peace and a co-operative democracy, to free themselves from the restrictive shackles of the old capitalist order which not only condemned human beings to economic servitude but denied them the right to live democratic

lives of personality, culture and refinement. How these democratic aims of the masses must triumph over those pernicious schemes of the capitalist oligarchy, and how in so triumphing, innumerable obstacles must be overcome, are matters which will be dealt with in a subsequent chapter.

The Sankey Declaration of the Rights of Man is a direct manifestation of the democratic tradition inherent in the people, for that declaration of a United Nations democratic plan for the post-war world which we have urged in the preceding paragraphs, is not an innovation but in direct line of development of the traditional culture upon which European civilisation is based. In the Sankey Declaration the masses at least find themselves articulate; they recognise in it the fundamental laws upon which democracy ultimately rests. The absence of any official recognition of sanction seems to suggest that the present governments of the western democracies will not adopt the new democratic plan as an all embracing war aim; it is therefore incumbent on the people themselves to create a united demand for a virile democracy devoid of those conditions which gave rise to offensive fanaticisms such as Nazism. It is an unachieved democracy for which we are fighting, it is not for something which we have lost or which is at stake. It is perhaps the noblest task that has been set mankind—the achievement of this world democracy, but, as we have seen, even while we struggle against Nazism (which is nothing but the manifestation of our own despair), there exists within those countries that are accounted to be 'democracies' *par. excellence*, powerful forces of reactionary and anti-revolutionary elements, which are inimical to a new democratic order and

which even while they ostensibly co-operate in suppressing the Nazis, betray the masses by contriving to arrange a restoration of the old order.

SUMMARY

Here then we have the stage set for the mighty struggle that will ensue between the forces of democracy on one part and those of the old order on the other. Within the minor vortex of the war against Nazi-Fascism, the clash has occurred already. Everywhere in social, political and economic spheres, we note the effects of premature conflicts between the interests of a progressive democracy and those of the reactionary elements. The issues at stake are so tremendous for humankind, that the combatants in this greater war of ideas, cannot dare to wait till the physical struggle against the gangster nations have come to an end. A dual war is in progress, a war within a war, but the war of ideas cuts across all national boundaries, it ignores cultures and religious beliefs, it takes no cognisance of one's colour of the skin, it is a war in which every one of us is engaged. Either for the *New Democratic Order* or for the *Old Order* which has resulted in the present war at the end of a long line of sufferings and abuses tolerated too long for too few and by too many. How then are the forces of the new democracy to organise themselves? What precisely are the forces which must be overcome? And what will this new democratic order be in its initiatory stages? These are matters which we shall attempt to deal with in the following sections.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIALISM AND THE NEW DEMOCRATIC ORDER

THE preceding chapter has postulated then, that the present war is being fought not only to abolish Nazi-Fascism, but replace those conditions of the old order which gave rise to this menace to civilisation. The phrase 'menace to civilisation' has been bandied about with such careless abandon, that its significance is not readily appreciated. Civilisation palpably cannot be identified with the material aspects of the conditions in which we live today; cynics indeed are only too ready to make the sneering gibe that civilisation, like the philosopher's beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder, and that what we elect to term civilisation is nothing but magnified barbarism, based on the inspirations of primitive animalism. Such an assertion, so far as it is tempered by a measure of truth, is difficult to counter, but to subscribe to it is to be wholly opposed to the spirit of this book. Only the positive vigour engendered by the belief that man is a rational animal (despite psycho-analysis) and that he recognises the moral law of what is absolutely good and what is absolutely bad (despite philosophers), only such a belief in the 'ultimate decency' of human-kind, is it possible, against all the mountain of pessimism and

cynicism, to concern ourselves with the problem of achieving a nobler, a finer state in which man's personality may thrive in an atmosphere of democratic freedom and fraternity. This civilisation then, of which we speak, and which we declare is at stake, is a particular essence which is a heritage of the people. It establishes the claim, derived from the Christian-Hellenic tradition, that there are certain social goods, liberty, fraternity and equality and the life of personality, that must and can be achieved by mankind. This liberal tradition or the striving for the good that it provides is the civilisation that is at stake in this war. Already a large section of German youth has been brutalised and degraded beyond recovery; they are as animals totally insensible to the wider, nobler advantages of the liberal tradition. Undemocratic as the western English speaking nations have been, and outrageous as has been the conduct at times of their governments, these essential democratic ideals have never been nullified or abolished as they have been in Germany. Even though they have never been realised in practice and have seldom been made the basis of a practical social planning, politicians, recognising these principles as the heritage of the people, have continued to pay them lip-service. So this essential civilisation lived, as it had never an opportunity to do in Nazi-Fascist states. But it lived in an atmosphere of hypocritical, lethargic recognition; it never received the sincere dynamic spirited support of a progressive revolutionary. The Nazis with the sincere thoroughness of a people in despair renounced democratic principles; we flattered them cajoled them, played about with them, we

compromised, hesitated..... We never adopted democracy. But our consolation and hope at this hour is that though we never renounced democracy, and though we never adopted it in practice, its principles are so much the inherent essence of our culture that they continue to live as the cherished possession of the people.

The time has come when these principles of liberty, fraternity and equality must be reasserted and vigorously championed in the face of all opposition wherever this hostility may spring from. These are the only principles which will evoke the whole-hearted enthusiasm of the people, the only principles that will give the lie to the negative doctrine of Nazism..... It is the people's case, not the case studiously evolved behind a Foreign Office window that will bring us the conditions of victory which we so much desire. It is a whirlwind that must arise from the people and among the people into a united demand that politicians cannot ignore or will ignore at their peril.... What then is this whirlwind; what specifically is the case which we may champion and of which the democratic principles stated above constitute the ultimate achievement? Such a case we find in Socialism.

So many millions of words have been expended on the subject of Socialism, that in writing about it, it behoves us to clarify it, to unburden it of the plethora of misleading appendages with which it has come to be associated. What we would emphasise then, as a point of the greatest importance is that Socialism is not an alternative to either Nazi-Fascist totalitarianism or democracy. Socialism to a certain degree is inevitably inherent in both. Precisely because

Socialism is not an *end* in itself but a *means* to the new democracy. Democracy, as we have stressed in the first chapter, is a rare beautiful thing, not to be conceived of as a certain characteristic political machinery achievable with the minimum effort and ease. Democracy is the end-result of a long and arduous process of continuous effort and discipline; this intervening period is that of applied socialism. Socialism is the task of ordering the material conditions of society in a manner which will facilitate the pursuit of the full life of personality which is a condition of a virile and progressive democracy. Socialism cannot therefore be identified with democracy; even if the Nazi-Fascists have been suppressed and those forces inimical to progressive democracy have been routed, and mankind sets about the task of reordering the world, democracy is impossible of achievement. Rigid control and discipline then are absolute necessities, and in this socialism for democracy will initially partake of a totalitarian flavour in which the principle of individual freedom is suppressed. But in surrendering to the discipline of socialism, we are not abandoning the rational freedom of democracy; in fact we are as yet incapable of rational freedom. What we conceive to be the freedom of democracy is nothing but the reckless abandon of the jungle. Jungle freedom must then be sacrificed in order that rational freedom may be achieved. In the chapters on economic disintegration, we have seen how the jungle freedom of economic individuality advocated by *laissez-faire* led to ultimate disaster.....Myopic intellectuals mistook and still continue to mistake jungle freedom for rational freedom, and set up a

pathetic blather regarding the rights of man when any semblance of control and discipline was introduced by the state. This distinction between the two freedoms cannot be over-emphasised, and confusion of thought about them is disastrous to any constructive effort.

To achieve rational freedom then, it is the task of socialism to establish those conditions which conduce to such freedom; the old order maintained conditions in which only the jungle freedom of personal acquisition could function. Now the latter is an outrageous anachronism that must be succeeded by a more sane, more humane, more practical democratic state which will give mankind the opportunity of fully realising all that it has in it to be. The imposition of control and discipline by socialism will inevitably meet with considerable opposition, especially from the masses of the middle and labouring classes, who while welcoming social legislation and control, fear that this centralisation of control and power may lead to Fascist dictatorship. This is precisely what happened in Europe when in the chaos of post-war Germany of 1918 the Weimar democracy was utterly incapable of lifting the nation out of the morass of degrading collapse, and when later Nazism arrived, German capitalists and big business were only too glad to agree to a Fascist capitalist state in which capitalism would continue under the ægis of the state. Capitalism threatened by socialism is all too willing to turn Fascist rather than abdicate in favour of a new order. If then, the present war is won and the peace is lost and the forces of socialism have been unable to achieve their revolutionary objectives, nevertheless a

sort of socialistic control may be introduced, used as a means not to democracy but to totalitarian Fascism. This is a danger for which we must be constantly prepared; either the democratic socialist case is vigorously pressed forward, or the field be left open for the indescribable chaos of the post-war world to relapse into the old capitalism in the garb of Fascism. Ironically enough, we would then have fought Nazism and suppressed it, even while we succumbed to precisely those forces which gave rise to Fascism. We will defeat the Nazis, only to flatter them by a faithful imitation.

This is a very real danger that cannot be discounted by those who are working for the socialist cause, and should give rise to the realisation that the powers against which socialism is arrayed are extremely formidable. To the consideration of these powers we have set aside a separate section. For the present we need to emphasise that disciplinary control is an essential feature of a post-war socialism if it is ultimately to lead to a vital democracy...Democracy presupposes not only rational freedom, social fellowship and the sense of service, not only an economic system that lifts man above material cares, but man with the education and culture to pursue the life of personality and happiness. We are so far from the achievement of these absolute factors of democracy that they are often described as utopian ideals impossible of achievement; admittedly the prospect towards democracy is long and perilous, but given the determination and steadfastness of purpose, a disciplined socialism will gradually condition itself into a living democracy. What precisely then will be the nature of this discipline to be imposed by socialism?

Here then we touch upon the factor of environment, this term being used in this text as denoting all those conditions material, psychological and spiritual that contribute to the formation of character. We are unavoidably the product of our environment; it follows therefore that the conditions of our existence and by which we are moulded, are of primary importance both to the individual and to the state. Totalitarianism has grasped this fact and the Germans have especially applied the principle with Nordic thoroughness. They have imposed a rigid control on the individual and dictate precisely from the cradle to the grave how the individual life may be conducted. Education, religion, art, culture, sport—every sphere of human activity is rigidly harnessed to the Nazi cause; through them working as environmental forces, the individual citizen is moulded into the perfect Nazi. We are quite familiar with the fanatical youths who constitute the S.S. troops as distinct from the more stolid, humane, elderly German service men. These youths have been moulded by conditions into which they were born; the rigid control initially imposed by the Nazi state can well afford to 'wither away' in the approved Lenin fashion, for as far as these natural Nazis are concerned there can be no question of a revolt. So soon as the older generation passes away, control may be considerably relaxed, and Nazism will continue within Germany as its natural political ideology. The public even though they are given access to foreign sources of cultural influences, will be immune from them precisely because they have already adopted Nazism as their national and natural heritage, just as most Christians are Christians because they were born into a community which was

predominantly Christian, and it was therefore convenient to do as the law of the majority suggested. In Nazism then, we have a most convincing instance of the power of environment, a power which socialism must adapt for its own purposes.

Man is a self-centred and therefore imperfect creature; in the effort to achieve an ultimate good he requires to be subjected to discipline while those conditions conducive to the moulding of the democratic citizen, are being enforced by an enlightened power. So soon as the environment thus imposed starts functioning (to use a rather unorthodox but expressive phraseology) the society which is being subjected to this treatment will, in the course of time, be thoroughly moulded into harmony by and with its environment. That is definitely the task of socialism; it must establish the conditions of the environment of democracy.

The environment of the old order, though not completely abolished, has been considerably weakened by the war and is rapidly disintegrating. In the resulting chaos socialism advocates certain conditions which in aggregate constitute the environment of democracy.

ECONOMIC

A compromise between the old *laissez-faire* and planned capitalism, necessitated by the exigencies of war, is clearly inadequate both in the waging of the war and in the reconstruction that will come after it. What is required then, is a national economic plan that is thorough and yet not rigid; the latter need not necessarily be sacrificed to the former.

The thoroughness is based on broad principles, while the lack of absolute rigidity leaves room for flexibility in the detailed application of these principles. Centralised bureaucratic control, we may point out, tends toward excessive thoroughness and overlooks the flexibility in the application required for regional differences and characteristics. Such an economic plan finds its initial cue in the most comprehensive and unpretentious definition of a democracy—Government of the people, by the people, for the people. It is not for nothing that Abraham Lincoln reiterated the phrase 'the people' three times; he did this precisely because in a democracy 'the people' is three times as important as any other factor. The people represent consumption which is the natural end of all production; the former is the necessary complement of the latter. That, must be the key-characteristic of the new economic system. Public Service not Private Profit. Interests of the Consumer, not those of the Producer. Economic power in the control of the People and not in those of a Section of the People. We may set out the necessary fundamental principles as follows:

- (a) That there should be no privileged class dictating to those in its economic power how they should earn their living.
- (b) That every citizen should ensure security for himself and his family by the possession of such an income as will enable him to observe the following conditions of decent living:
 - 1. Children well-educated and well nourished.
 - 2. Family housed in decency and dignity consonant with health of mind, body and spirit.

3. Means for appropriate recreation and the development of intellectual and cultural faculties according to individual tendencies and capabilities.
 4. Personality and confidence engendered by freedom from material cares.
- (c) That every citizen should be free to press forward a case in defence of those interests which he holds in common with a certain section of the public, but that the interests of the community override such sectional interests if the latter is diametrically opposed to the former.
- (d) That the community in its conglomerate capacity as the ultimate consumer should be given a voice in the conduct of the nation's industrial machinery.
- (e) That every citizen in the capacity of a labourer should also be given a voice in the conduct of the business or industry in which he is engaged.
- (f) That steps should be taken to abolish poverty (by maximum production), abolish inequality and periodic or chronic unemployment.
- (g) That whatever economic reforms are suggested they should be subject to the criticism of and determination by the people.

All these principles are harnessed to the main socialist ideal (not utopian in the sense that it is unattainable) of the greatest good of the greatest number. This ideal is rooted in the passion for service and for a prosperity that is common to all.

Economic control by the state need not, indeed should not be centralised in bureaucratic machinery. Efficient industrial and business organisers are the men to conduct a state controlled economic system, not civil servants whose capacity for bungling in matters beyond routine is well known. Concomitantly the public, the people who represent the absolute of democracy, and who vest power of economic control in the government, must be given adequate facilities to collaborate with the state and contribute to the conduct of economic system for the common welfare of the community. The essential rights of man as provided by the Sankey Declaration (see appendix) not only serves as a fundamental law of democracy, but as a safeguard against the abuses which a centralisation of power may encourage on the part of corrupt holders of power.

Such are the principles upon which a new democratic economic plan must be based. How such a plan is to be applied within the existing conditions, is a matter beyond the scope of the present volume. We need only establish the point that if it is the genuine desire of the people to achieve democracy then the changes suggested above may be effective. If it is the genuine desire of the people to achieve democracy, then a democratic economic system compatible with the principles outlined above, is imperative. The full democracy of personality transcending economic and material matters is impossible until a basic economic system is laid as a condition of this democracy.

RELIGION

In considering religion as a social force within the new democratic framework, we enter a field in which

there is more scope for leisured controversy. The economic plan suggested above is in the category of urgent and immediate socialist innovation; religion approximates more to a powerful social force, only when the economic and material conditions of democracy have been achieved. But then, it may pertinently be asked, cannot religion be harnessed to this socialist task of establishing the conditions necessary for a virile and progressive democracy? Cannot religion concern itself with the ordering of society in economic and political fields? There are not a few indications in the contemporary world that individual spokesmen of the Church have veered round to this point of view, and accepted frankly the accusation that the Church has shirked its duty in not actively participating both by denunciation and leadership in the establishment of a social ordering compatible with Christian principles. In a word the established Church has at last been awakened from its lethargy by the calamitous urgencies of war; and if the deliberations of the Malvern Conference are to be accepted as representative of the decisions of the Church as a whole, then manifestly the Church has turned socialist. Then even more manifestly, the Church is a powerful factor in favour of the advocacy of the socialist case, now and after the war.....

The Church it is clear has suddenly discovered itself in a false position, and hurriedly contrives now to adapt itself to the rapidly changing conditions. How far will it be able to effect such a readjustment; how far is it willing to renounce its former allegiances and adopt the cause of the people, the cause of socialism, the cause of democracy, the cause of Christianity

as evolved by the personality of Jesus Christ? These are problems which cannot be decided for the Church; they are matters which the Church must decide for itself, tempered in its decision, whatever its recourse, that it stands before the judgment of posterity—and not very distant posterity at that.

If opinion is a prelude to action then the Church has every chance of allying herself with the revolutionary forces. Dr. William Temple (the archbishop of Canterbury) has especially been most explicit in his denunciation of the private ownership of the industrial resources of the community, declaring that the acquisitive spirit engendered in a profiteering world is contrary to the teaching of Christ and that such economic and social conditions make it increasingly difficult for the individual to lead a Christian life. Such a statement from a leading dignitary of the Church though not constituting an absolute *volte-face* nevertheless was a startling deviation from what had hitherto been the traditional conservatism of the Church. It does not in itself indicate a change in the attitude of the body of the Church.....But the fact that the Malvern Conference accepted the contentions cited above, appear to indicate that, irrespective of a few dissentients, the Church is unanimous in deploring the economic and social inequalities that characterise the old order. The Church does not hold itself responsible for the actual application of the principles which it propounds, but Dr. Temple claims that it has been and is the prerogative of the Church to concern itself with the economic and social ordering of a community, to ensure that those in whom power and responsibility are vested by the people, should utilise

such power and responsibility in a manner consonant with the tenets of the Christian doctrine. Dr. Temple stresses the fact that economic and sociological technicalities constitute specialised fields with which the Church is incompetent to deal; therefore it is not within the limits of the Church to advocate this or that policy of economic or social reform. It merely understands that any specific policy is or is not consonant with Christian principles and accordingly confers or withholds its moral sanction.

What then is the general policy of reform with which a reformed Church could co-operate in establishing a people's democracy? It is inevitably Socialism. Socialism is specifically the application of Christian principles to the material ordering of life. Socialism stresses the rights of the individual (paradoxical as this may be made to appear); it strives for the greatest good for the greatest number; it uplifts the individual above material cares; it appeals to the individual's sense of justice and public service; it affords the individual a genuine freedom and engenders in the community a spirit of social fellowship. Socialism is the executive of Christian endeavour, its advocates supersede the missionaries of old; in this it is an integral part of Christianity itself.

Socialism then may look to a reformed Church for considerable co-operative support, for the assumption indeed of the leadership of the people against the warped and restrictive traditions of the old order. As a preliminary to the assumption of such leadership, the Church must renounce all vestiges of conservatism, in an absolute acceptance of the fact that Christianity is a continually revolutionary and progressive force. It

must relinquish its duties as a bulwark of the privileges of the upper classes; it must cease to abuse its social prerogatives by advocating such foreign policies as will tend to the selfish interests of the governing classes. Instead it must endeavour to reassert itself as a creative religion finding its functional environment in a new community which is now struggling to be born. Vested interests and social prestige must liquidate before the virile, overriding interests of a society recognising no hierarchical privilege, but standing as a symbol expressing an abiding faith in common humanity. In short, the Church must come to itself and find a brotherhood of common men. It must embrace the creative spirit of modern science, and abandon the dogmatic tradition and mediaeval scholasticism which have for so long retarded Christianity's development in the social order so unmistakably represented by Jesus Christ. Only by such an extensive process of disentanglement is it possible for the Church to play a major role in the co-operative task of establishing a socialist democratic new order...Socialism itself is energetic and spirited but the tasks that confront it in the readjustment of human society are so tremendous, that it can ill afford to see the Church incapable of rising to the demands made of it, at this crucial hour in the history of human race. The Church will be untrue to its own essence if it rejects the call for salvation which the world's chaos has set up; in the face of a crisis such as this the Church has in the past, shown itself spiritually capable of regenerating itself to meet the challenge of new conditions suddenly upthrown by the evolutionary process. In this greatest crisis of all, it is inconceivable

that it will fail the cause of humanity, it is inconceivable yet possible.....

A few paragraphs back you may have noticed that we refer to socialism as an integral part of Christianity: it follows then that Christianity's role is not confined to that sphere of materialism with which socialism is concerned, but extends to regions of which socialism takes no cognisance. This we may simply term the Christianity of the spirit, as distinct from the Christianity of materialism. We may illustrate the distinction by citing the grand creative national structure of our time—the Soviet Union. In Russia we find the Christianity of materialism, but for reasons that are peculiar to the country the Russians have as yet been denied the Christianity of spirit. Often the absence of the latter in Russia's noble constructive effort is made the basis of a dastardly and totally unjustified attack of the Soviet Union... Such critics no doubt consider themselves paragons of Christian virtue, and it will presumably come as a shock to them that the Soviet Union is more Christian in its Christianity of materialism than any of the western democracies either in the Christianity of materialism or in that of spirit. They are moreover so utterly unable to grasp the full significance of the socialist democratic task, that they conceive the Soviet Union to be the perfect socialist state *par excellence*. Soviet officials and advocates of the Russian economic and social progressive plans will be the first to admit that the task which the nation has undertaken is far from complete, but given the perseverance and the peace and the sincere co-operative sympathy and assistance of western

socialist forces, the Soviet Union will ultimately realise the vital democracy of which we have spoken throughout this book. Those who deride the Soviet Union would do well therefore, first to realise that the Russians are pioneers in the field of socialist reconstruction, that they had the most discouraging and daunting obstacles with which to contend, and secondly, that as a consequence though the Soviet Union has in our century taken the right step in the right direction, her task is far yet from being completed.... Indeed to speak of completion is in itself a misnomer, a loose, slovenly use of words of which we are all guilty, for there is no stabilised entity approximating to what theorists call a complete and settled democracy. Democracy achieved in part or in the whole is continually in expansion and transformation; it is as we have stressed dynamic not static, it throbs with the energy of a living spirit.

We have deviated from our main topic, and must withhold further comment on the Russian experiment till a subsequent chapter. Here we hope to establish, with the aid of Russia as an illustrative example, the contention that socialism is an integral part of Christianity in that it is a Christianity of materialism, but that over and above this, there is a Christianity of the spirit that is a final achievement of a vital democracy. Herein lies the justification of Bernard Shaw's startling assertion that communism is a religion, and that the Russians do not require any other. The assertion indeed has been interpreted, as an ironic expansion of the dictum that religion is an opiate of the masses, but such an interpretation is false, for where true Christian values are concerned, Mr. Shaw's

assertion may be accepted as literally true, though this vitriolic Irishman may not have intended it to be so taken.

A reformed Church then finds itself confronted with a two-fold task: First to assume the leadership of the people in establishing, in co-operation with the forces of socialism, a Christianity of materialism. Such an achievement will involve :

- (a) the complete subjugation of the old order,
- (b) establishment of economic conditions outlined above.

Secondly, the Church must concern itself with the nobler, though not considerably more important task of turning men's minds to the thought of God. Herein is the religion interpreted as spiritual relations between Man and his Maker. This is democracy in function.

Let it be asserted with the utmost conviction and emphasis that the Christianity of the spirit is wholly dependent on the Christianity of materialism; the one cannot be divorced from the other. Christian socialism is imperative as a condition of the Christian democracy to which it gives rise. They are complementary and rigidly sequential. In passing on to a consideration of education, we may point out that education is within the province of Christian socialism, but that culture is its fruit in the province of Christian democracy.

EDUCATION

It will be recalled that we are here engaged in establishing certain conditions of what we have termed the environment of democracy. If the forces of

economic structure and religion are powerful in their formative function, those of education are certainly no less important. Educational environment, as a moulding force, is obvious, so obvious that we tend to exclude both economic and religious conditions as irrelevant in the light of what a planned education is capable of doing. Note that we have deliberately used the phrase *planned education*; is our educational system planned? We think not. The O.E. D. obligingly supplies two sets of definitions for the word 'system' and as this is a word recurring often in this text, we may facilitate understanding and obviate confusion by deciding specifically which of the two meanings of the word we have in mind when speaking of an educational system. The first definition runs 'a set or assemblage of things connected, associated, or interdependent so as to form a complex unity.' The second runs 'a whole composed of parts in orderly arrangement, according to some scheme or plan.' To deny then that prevailing economic or educational systems are not systems at all, is a fallacious argument. The present educational system is a system in that it is a complex unity, ill assorted and disorderly yes, nevertheless forming a complete whole and functioning in a specific manner. When we speak of a *planned education* however, we revert to the second definition of the O.E.D. This system consists of an ordered unity functioning on specific lines for a specific pre-determined purpose.

The educational system that is a complex unity, as we have seen, has been utterly discredited; it is a conglomerate sprawling whole, an organic growth, a bed-fellow of the capitalist economic system which is

the mainstay of the old order. The socialist democratic tendency is to pass from this educational imbroglio to the ordered efficiency and calm sense of public service and purpose that are essential to a planned educational system. If however the latter is an important necessary condition of a vital democracy, it is not more important than the economic and religious conditions described above. Economic conditions especially are basic, for if they are not observed, there can be no possibility whatever of a firm structural framework for the new order. The means is as important as the ends especially if the means constitute a part of that which we ultimately seek.

Any plan necessarily implies a purpose. A plan divorced from any purpose is not a plan. A planned education therefore, involves a sense of purpose and direction. Before we proceed to inquire into the nature of such a purpose, it is helpful to bear in mind first, that any planned education which we may evolve, far from being a pioneering venture, will have as illuminating precedents the planned educational systems of the totalitarian dictatorships, and that secondly, we cannot afford to adopt a prejudicial outlook upon educational planning in totalitarian countries. The latter, especially Germany, are unparalleled in social planning, and are more experienced than the democracies....We need also bear in mind the fact that the educational systems in Germany, Italy and Japan are perfect instances of planning, for they serve with remarkable efficiency all such specific purposes which the Nazi-Fascist planners may have had in mind. The German educational system has been understandably used by the state as an environmental

force, it has been planned with the oné dominant purpose of perpetuating the doctrine of Nazism, to mould young minds into so many receptacles of Nazi perversion and false values. The deliberate suppression of the moral and spiritual values which are the essence of a higher civilisation, is a ruthless necessity, for the educational environment by which the mind of the individual citizen is greatly moulded, has in Germany been subordinated to one specific purpose—the production of perfect young Nazis, synthetic Nazis produced according to the principles of mass production, all alike, all subservient, all fanatically devoted to the Fuehrer and the Nazi doctrine. Education, thus planned, has served the purpose for which it was planned; in Germany it has functioned to perfection. The situation is identical in Italy and Japan though slight regional and national deviations have of course characterised all the three systems.

Here then are three thoroughly planned educational systems, successfully subordinated to the authoritarian dictates of one-party states. Yet another planned educational system does exist, and we say 'another' with conscious deliberation, for in referring to the Soviet educational system as quite distinct from systems existing in the dictatorship, we incur the false criticism that there is nothing to choose between the Soviet system and the Nazi system, and that they are conveniently regarded as one and the same manifestation of the same dictatorial impulse. Nothing indeed could be more perniciously false than such an assertion; that people should so facilely subscribe to such a view, serves merely to indicate how greatly we are influenced in our mental processes by prejudices

and mental blinkers, and how far from immune we are from the propaganda of those who would paint the Soviet Union in the same colours as that of Nazi Germany. We cannot engage ourselves here in discussing the merits or the demerits of the Soviet experiment (this is attempted later). We are only concerned to point out the distinction that exists between the two systems; both are planned, both are rigidly enforced, both are conducted by one-party states, both are conscious of a supreme end in view..... But while the Soviet system is based on simple moral values such as that it is wrong to exploit one's fellows, that achievements actuated by desire for personal acquisition are ignoble, that service for the Community, for the increase of the common good and happiness of all, is the main purpose of work—while the Soviet educational system functions as an environmental force for democracy and individual intellectual liberation, the Nazi system seeks to pervert the mind of the child-citizen, it stifles inquiry, eliminates free speech and inculcates false values in direct contradistinction to the Christian civilisation based on values common to all other European countries. We will not continue to labour the point for the distinction is obvious; the dictatorship systems and the Soviet system, though they are planned, i. e. though they are to that degree socialistic, differ in that the former seeks to achieve Nazi-Fascism and has in greater part achieved this end, while the latter seeks to achieve a socialist democracy, and is a long way yet from achieving this end though it is on the right path.....

So far we have been considering planned systems, defined by the O.E.D. as 'a whole composed of parts in

orderly arrangement'. When we next speak of an educational system existing in the English-speaking 'democracies' of the west, we obviously do not mean 'a whole composed of parts in orderly arrangement', for though there may be a recognisable whole, there certainly are no 'parts in orderly arrangement'. Instead this is a system which the O.E.D. speaks of as an assemblage of things forming a complex unity...And it is precisely that, a complex unity, peculiar to itself and peculiar to the conditions prevalent in the English-speaking capitalist states. The English educational system has indeed absolutely nothing in common, even the word 'system' being used in an entirely different sense.

- (a) It is an organic growth and therefore unplanned.
- (b) It is not rigorously enforced by dictatorial methods, yet it continues, despite its many shortcomings, to be accepted by the people.
- (c) Paradoxical as this may be, it is without any conscious specific purpose for purpose presupposes a planner or planners, yet it does most definitely serve a very useful purpose.
- (d) It has not been recognised by the state as an environmental force.

The capitalist states have for reasons which we cannot inquire into here, managed to evade for so long complete state intervention in economic and educational spheres. Force of circumstances had driven other states to adopt planned systems, but the conception of planning as inimical to individual liberty has been so deep-rooted in the common thought of

capitalist society, that it has with difficulty been abandoned—though as yet not completely. The argument that planning is contrary to democratic freedom still continues to be used with all the careless abandon of the ignorant warped in their outlook by mental blinkers. However it is, we believe, generally conceded that state intervention in the form of socialism is an inevitability under present world conditions, and that though such intervention need not necessarily conduce to democracy, and may lead to Fascism, it is not incompatible with democracy. Indeed, such planned systems are a condition of democracy if this social ideal is to be realised in the future.

The unplanned organically grown educational systems prevalent in the capitalist states have been anything but democratic. Having resulted as an inevitable outgrowth of the existing economic capitalist system, it could not but reflect the latter's shortcomings and undemocratic inequalities. The result being that the educational system perpetuates rather than militate against the existing order; like religion it tends to be static rather than dynamic. It is pre-eminently a product of the old order which it faithfully sustains by the plodding, lethargic conservatism which it shares with the old economic and religious orders. We have presented above what we believe to be the four main characteristic differences of the English educational system from the other systems which we have reviewed earlier. (a), (b) and (d) have either been explained in the text or are self-evident, and we need not therefore concern ourselves with them here. Characteristic (c) however holds for us, as we shall see, a more than merely paradoxical interest

According to (c) the educational system is without any conscious specific purpose, for to have a purpose would involve a planner or planners which the present unplanned system has not got. Yet, we contend, it does serve a purpose. The point of distinction lies in the fact that the system is not *for* a specific purpose, but in its functioning definitely does serve a purpose *incidentally*. What then is this purpose which is served incidentally? It is to maintain an established social system. This is a truth which Hitler, Mussolini, Stalin and the Japanese have grasped; it is a truth also which the English governing classes have consciously or unconsciously grasped. Characteristic (d) asserts that the educational system has not been recognised by the state as an environmental force. That is precisely so, for it is never blatantly declared that the English educational system has been evolved to maintain the existing social conditions. Such a declaration is never made because it is so obviously untrue, for unlike the systems in the totalitarian countries, the English organically grown educational system has NOT been evolved for a specific purpose and is NOT recognised or used by the state to maintain the established social order. Yet it is made to do both these things. How, we shall presently see.

Whether or not the fact is recognised consciously or unconsciously by a state or a certain class within the state, that no social order can ever be maintained unless it is supported by the massive environmental force of education, the truth is in practical application wherever a society exists. The totalitarian countries are consciously exploiting this truth as an openly declared part of their national policy. In England, the truth is not

recognised, but it is there in application, and functioning if slightly inefficiently on the same lines as those of the consciously planned systems of the totalitarian powers. The totalitarian system is a consciously planned composite whole, while the capitalist educational system is an organically grown complex unity, but they have this in common that they both serve a purpose—the maintenance of the existing social order.

It then follows that a capitalist educational system maintains a capitalist society. And that in conceiving a new social order of socialist democracy, the present educational system cannot possibly be tolerated, with its unchristian, undemocratic inequalities and maintenance of class power. We will not in this connection fall victim to the error of abusing the Public Schools as not a few social reformers and socialists have done. Indeed the institution known as the Public School merits our most sincere respect, for no dictatorial one-party state could have wished for a more efficient and effective environmental force than the Public School, for the supreme purpose of maintaining the established order. Now, it is not only in respect of the fees that the Public School is an establishment of the privileged classes. The public school has through its environmental power produced citizens of the privileged classes mentally equipped not only to perpetuate the class as a class, but to preserve its privileges and social dominance. If we may be justified in resorting to a simplification, it may be said that a citizen subjected to the public school environmental 'treatment' emerges at the other side in the manner of a mass produced car, synthetically fit to be welcomed

within the hallowed circle of the governing classes. To that extent he is not a 'natural' product; he is synthetic. But then all education, and civilisation are by the same measure synthetic which, if denied, would mean fundamental animalism exhibiting the human animal in its most primitive genre. It is therefore not that a public school education results in synthetically produced citizens, or that it is denied to the majority, which constitute the point with which we would quarrel. That the majority suffer from an outrageously unequal income is a situation which must be remedied, but that they are thus denied public school education for their sons is comparatively a minor point which need not worry us unduly, for the intelligent labouring classes are veering round to the view that a public school education far from being desired, should be scrapped as an anachronism. Their quarrel and our quarrel is with the point that a public school education functions as a mainstay of the privileged classes, and that even if such education was made accessible to the masses the result would be not any solution of the problem but sheer chaos. In so far as a public school education has meaning, it is that it is meant for a certain privileged section of the community; so soon as this education is released to masses, it ceases to have meaning and leads to political and cultural chaos, for we cannot have a nation consisting of citizens equipped with mentalities peculiar to a governing class, when obviously there are no other classes to be governed.

We may note here what may well be termed the vicious circle of a capitalist society. Enjoying absolute economic power they deny the masses the doubtful privileges of a public school education from which they

derive the advantages of a mental equipment allegedly qualifying them to executive and administrative positions in the Government, Civil Service and higher professions. Such lucrative positions lead to greater economic dominance over the masses who by sheer economic impotence are unable to storm the charmed circle of sweet privileges exclusively reserved for wealth and the old school tie...All this however cannot be taken to imply that the governing classes are in any way conspiring to repress the masses or that they are a domineering and unpleasant set of men and women. The reverse indeed is the case. A more agreeable and cultured though not necessarily intelligent, class of people, it is difficult to conceive; they would appear to be graced with all the virtues of charm, tact, judgment and political sense, so that it is difficult to deny that their privileges are not justified. Herein lies their strategic strength for if by the use of privileges they justify such privileges, the uncritical observer is apt to decide that the governing classes do deserve all the advantages which they enjoy. Hence the not very astonishing fact that they have been able to maintain an unequal society with the acquiescence of those who suffer most under such a system. Respect for the hierarchy and a deep-rooted belief that social and economic inequality is willed by an undefined Almighty, plus the blandishments of the Church which preaches contentment but not justice, have enabled the privileged classes to maintain their dominance with unconscious ease and seeming justification. They have moreover not committed the error of assuming absolute exclusiveness and rigidity; they have chosen rather to assimilate those of the under-privileged who have

shown exceptional intelligence and ability, and who might otherwise have used their energies against the interests of the privileged. Such an absorption of intelligence and economic power, so soon as these occurred into the governing classes, as an alternative to a dangerous conflict for power, served the interests of the privileged by strengthening them and proportionately weakening the docile masses. This may be interpreted as a facile strategy, but we pause to doubt whether this is so. It is certainly inconceivable that individual members of the governing class are consciously striving to maintain their dominance over the masses; such blatant and obvious repression would probably incite the masses to revolt. The root causes of this remarkable phenomenon of class privilege are more subtle and impossible of specific definition. Broadly it may be stated that a public school education, functioning as an environmental force, instils a certain attitude of mind into members of the privileged classes—an attitude based on the twin conception of privilege and sacrifice. Having been born into the privileged classes, and having been subjected since early boyhood to public school influences, it is inevitable that the privileges are taken for granted, and as an inalienable right of their own exclusive class. They conceive existing social conditions as the natural state ordained by forces over which man has no control. To oppose the existing order is therefore, on the basis of such an argument, to oppose nature, and if nature is identified with a supreme deity, then this deity is likewise opposed. This argument carries considerable conviction for many, even in this age of so-called intellectual enlightenment.

Let it be allowed that the privileged are sincere in their belief that they as a class are entitled to privileges, the fact of their sincerity does not absolve either them or the social order which they maintain from the dictates of the evolutionary process. The inequality which the public school system engenders is unjust, but the system itself is to be abolished not only on this score, but because changing conditions have made it anachronism, and therefore its perpetuation a crass stupidity. We may in a liberal moment even admit that there may have been a time when educational privilege was justified, but society today cannot tolerate economic inequality and educational privilege—the farce has become too blatantly obvious. The imperialist society which the public school continues to support is as 'dead' as a dodo; it cannot possibly have a place in the new socialist democratic order. Already it is sickening, already it is frantically searching for respite like a flustered old maid whose wig has been whisked away by the wind.....It realises that it cannot hope to survive for long, yet it clings to its dear old traditions with all the pathetic faith of the credulous peasant afraid of and hostile to the unfamiliar.

The public school system has served its purpose well; now that time, and intelligence and social evolution have exposed it as the sham that it is, socialist democracy demands its absolute abolishment. Privileges, governing classes, and imperialism are but bad dreams of the past and among them must be numbered the public school. It has produced a class of men and women in an environment wholly divorced not only from democracy but from the spirit of the nation's common masses. Key appointments in the nation's

civic, social, judicial, military and religious life, are reserved for those who flaunt the old school tie, while the appointment of any person to an important diplomatic post who commenced his education at an elementary school is a miraculous exception to the rule and is apt to remain a nine days wonder in the newspapers.....Herein we note the significance of Disraeli's two nations.

The denial of a full and satisfying education to the masses has not only resulted in a scandalous waste of brain-power, not only condemned them to lives of frustration and neo-animalism, but has made all possibilities of a democracy improbable under the existing conditions. Like the Church with which we have dealt in a preceding section, the educational system must be renovated and democratised, it must in a word be utilised not only as a means to knowledge (this is its least important function) but as an environmental force moulding citizens into the socialist democrats of the new order to come. Discipline and control are again absolute requisites, especially in the initial stages but when once the appropriate environment is established it is only a matter of time before new generations grow into and accept as natural, the conditions of a socialist democracy. A critic might conceivably object that such a method is in the final analysis a practice whereby the state forcibly seeks to subject the people to organised propaganda, and that if such methods were resorted to, we would parallel the Nazis in our disregard of personal and intellectual freedom. The latter part of this argument devolves upon the word 'freedom' which we have fully discussed in the first

chapter; error and confusion result from our inability to distinguish between democratic liberty which is rational freedom and jungle liberty which is the freedom of anarchy. Otherwise our critic is justified in arguing that the educational system we propose and the method by which it should be applied, is nothing but a propaganda campaign on the part of the state. This is precisely so.

What is education but propaganda? What is an educational system but a propaganda organisation? These are merely matters of words with varying degrees of emotive significance. And what government is wholly divorced from the element of force? So long as any society today lacks democratic perfection, so long will it be necessary to employ an element of force whether in the achievement of Nazism or in the achievement of a socialist democracy. We have seen that there is a tendency towards the decline of power as the propaganda and its environmental force take effect, until finally state power is at a minimum. Initially however disciplinary power is necessary, but it is a more than regrettable error to identify such power with repression. Nazi power is repressive precisely because it denies the moral and spiritual values inherent in western civilisation; it is a negative force. The disciplinary power of a socialist democracy, however, is a positive force, it seeks to develop where Nazism seeks to stunt, it is a discipline imposed and willingly accepted by the majority of the people..... That state control is not repression, that such disciplinary power is not inimical to ultimate democratic liberty, are truths, which have been irrefutably proved for us in the first half of this

century by the Soviet Union. The truths have been proved yet not recognised, for it is common to declare that repression and the denial of liberty abound in the Soviet Union; how then are we to explain the magnificent defence of Stalingrad, how explain the willing scorching of earth, the burning of homes, the destroying of crops, and the passionate and loyal exuberance of spirit with which the citizens of the Soviet Union fight the Nazi invaders? Repression cannot breed such men as this, it cannot generate a noble spirit such as this, it cannot mould the nation into such a symbol of unparalleled unity...Only twenty years of education in the tenets of co-operative social service has enabled the Russians to lay the foundations of an economic socialism upon which the structure of democracy may be eventually built. The Soviets are not often thought of as fighting for democratic liberty, yet it is for nothing less that they have joined us as allies in the struggle against Nazi-Fascism.

Unlike economic problems of socialist transformation the establishment of a socialist democratic educational system by the state is a comparatively simple matter, and is well within the educationalists of the present day. In planning such a system however the following points may be borne in mind:

- (a) The raising of the school-leaving age to 16 or more.
- (b) Education in the form of creative and cultural activity, according to the individual's capabilities, continuing till nineteen or twenty.
- (c) The whole to be permeated by the spirit of character-training and education for citizenship.

- (d) The basis of adult education to be considerably widened and the project considerably intensified.
- (e) Private and public schools to be assimilated into a unified national system.
- (f) Intellectual ability to be the sole criterion by which every citizen's claim to higher learning may be measured.
- (g) The whole to be subordinated to the tenets of social service and the development of personality.

So much then as a sketch of the requirements of educational reform for a new democratic order. All the conditions of a socialist democracy which we have so far surveyed in the economic, religious and educational fields, far from being exhaustive, are merely meant to be representative and suggestive. Given the space, more perhaps could have been said about economic reform, but this would have involved entering into controversial conjecture wholly beyond the scope of this book. However the background as comprehensive a manner as is possible within the limits of the whole survey. The complex and diverse forces working to achieve a new order is not an impossible one, and indeed the only intelligent attitude towards the future in which the world is engaged at present. Intricate correlations and reactions present a picture of continual dynamic change. Every reaction upon action, as the process of progress or retrogression moves towards its inherent destiny.

especially to those who are sensibly capable enough to appreciate the drama of man's adventure on this earth, is truly inspiring and massively impressive. The contemplation of this noble dynamic scene, marred here and there, now and then and often, by human stupidity, yet stretching forth with illimitable possibilities before it, as a grand symbolic manifestation of man's striving for the good and full life, one achieves a certain serenity and catholicity of outlook that holds man not evil but stupid, not ultimately wicked, but inherently good. This is a healthy philosophy which accepts the contention of the pleader for humanity that man's errors of the past have been the outcome not so much of conscious purpose rooted in evil, but of mistaken judgment, rooted in the ignorance of what tends to the good and what tends to the bad.

The reader may excuse this little disquisition upon what he may regard an irrelevant diversion, when he realises that it has been interpolated as a preliminary preamble to a review in which we shall consider the nature of socialist democracy as it expresses itself in its purest form as creative culture. New democratic values will be ultimate conditions of the new order—conditions which are themselves the end which we seek. And what we may consider the end in the light of human enlightenment today, may tomorrow constitute the means to a yet nobler and higher civilisation. In dealing with socialist democratic conditions in the field of economic and religious and educational reform, we are not unnecessarily utopian, for the new policies urged, are transformations, however sweeping and radical, of existing systems whether they be economic or religious or educational. The transformation of these

systems and the consequent establishment of conditions favourable to the growth of a socialist democracy, is not an utopian achievement propounded in theory but impossible in practice. Given leadership, determination and spirit, and a proper appreciation of what is and what is not to be achieved, the transformation of the whole social fabric is a predominantly practical and therefore possible achievement.

If then the necessary socialist democratic conditions are established, that is if the appropriate environment is achieved, will a virile and vitally progressive democracy emerge? This whole book is a positive emphasis of the belief that such a democracy will be born not only of such conditions but of only such conditions. Democracy however will not follow hard on the heels of socialism; socialism, as we have warned, may with the most startling ease degenerate into a fascist dictatorship. But given the will and the determination and the courage to impose self-discipline, the socialist conditions of democracy will ultimately bear fruit in the form of a Christian socialist democracy permeated by the spirit of a creative culture. A Christian democracy—that is the final synthesis for which we strive, that is the *raison d'être* of all the painstaking socialist work that has been harnessed to this sane and healthy cause. In the last stage of this development, we see the crude, preliminary conditions 'withering away' to use Lenin's historic phrase, leaving the fruit of democracy untainted, yet rich with illimitable possibilities of expansion and progress before it.... What then will the nature of this creative culture be in the highest developed individual citizens of the new socialist Christian democracy?

Under the present dispensation the term 'culture' has been blessed by a curious assortment of significances and meanings, but one primary characteristic common to them all, is the assumption that culture is a thing apart from the general conduct of our severally individual lives. To declare that such-and-such a one is cultured or that he lives a cultured life is to contend that the person to whom we refer is worthy of specific attention in so far as his culture differentiates him from what is unconsciously termed euphemistically as an 'ordinary' life. We have grown accustomed to this usage of the word, and to regard culture in any other context necessitates a determined attempt of the mind before the new conception may be grasped. We deliberately describe this conception as new fully realising that though it may be new to us who have been born into a capitalist society, it is not new to humanity.... Our conception of culture then, is that creative culture is but a life of personality in harmonious function.

The Greeks had no word for culture; culture was inherent in the Greek mode of life, and it was not something that could possibly be divorced from life. Life and culture were identical. The Greeks practised good and noble architecture, good and noble sculpturing, good and noble production of poetry; their craftsmen were artists, and not the meanest of their artists were statesmen. The Greeks were not conscious of the fact that they were cultured; they only understood that they lived and not merely existed; and they lived moreover a life eminently worth fighting for if it were ever menaced by the hostile forces of barbarism. With the establishment and

extension of the Roman empire, (the Romans have been aptly described as the first large-scale capitalists in Europe—Herbert Read) culture became a commodity, a fashion tag to be flaunted by the wealthy and leisured classes, a polished, refined veneer to be acquired by those who could afford it. That was the Roman conception of culture; we have progressed only in so far as we acknowledge the fact that we share the same conception today.

Capitalism, and the spirit of materialistic acquisition, has always been incompatible with culture which is to declare that the capitalist system has never afforded man the opportunity of living the life of personality. And it is only the life of personality that can acquire for one that sense of serenity, happiness and well-being which is the prerogative of every democratic being in the ultimate democratic state. The Industrial Revolution in the beginning of the nineteenth century heralded the approach of capitalism in increasingly larger scales; it was then that culture was completely divorced from life, and acquired a sense in which it is regarded as eminently an unpractical yet socially valuable asset. The quality of practicalness denoted economic value; culture then according to such a criterion was relegated to the category of unessentials. Industrialism and machinery invoked new values—utility and cheapness and profit. Culture could not obviously thrive in such an atmosphere; it retired into the few homes in which the values of beauty, truth and disinterested service were yet cherished. But culture, as a way of life was absolutely divorced from the common masses. We are today very conscious of culture, even when such culture as

exists is but a simulacrum of the culture that might otherwise exist; and the more we are thus conscious of the gulf that separates the daily conduct of our lives from the life of creative culture, the more we realise how very desirable it is to achieve a synthesis such as that of the Greeks in which culture and life are one, and in which the former is not so much consciously appreciated as assumed to be the very warp and woof of life.

We may note that the socialist democratic conditions which we have so far surveyed are essentially materialistic, though they are as important if not more so than anything that might approximate to spiritualistic values, for as we have hitherto stressed without the former the latter can never be realised. Economic reform, the conditions of what we have termed the Christianity of Materialism, and educational reform, are representative of the scale in which the material foundations of life in society, must be renovated. But if materialism is a necessary condition of the appreciation of spiritual values—such as truth, beauty, goodness and happiness, we must by the same measure accord to these democratic values of a creative culture, the recognition as is due to them as constituting the supreme ends for which a democratic society strives. Socialism and materialism are to be observed only to be transcended ultimately by intangible values. The elaborations of the former wither away, the socialist discipline of which we have spoken withers away—leaving these values as the heart throb of a Christian democracy leading the life of creative culture. Idealistic, Utopian—yes; but not impossible of achievement, for they are but the inevitable and logical end of socialist

democracy, the living of the good and full life common among the Greeks but of which they were not conscious. In the conception of such a society, there are not men and artists, but just artists. This ultimate truth has been nobly enunciated by that profound Oriental Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy. 'The artist is not a special kind of man, but every man is a special kind of artist'.

Limitations of space, plus the sense of caution evoked by the realisation that the several parts of a conglomerate whole must be proportionate, compel us to bring this survey to a premature conclusion, tempting though the prospect of further speculation is on the lines suggested. In conclusion however, a few lines must be devoted to the consideration of what we have provisionally termed 'an enlightened power'. It is all too easy to misconstrue such a phrase in such a context when the subject under review is extremely controversial. We have argued, we hope convincingly, that disciplinary power is an absolute essential, especially during the initial stages of a socialist democracy. Obviously such power must be enlightened in the sense that its ends are democratic and progressive and therefore not fascist and retrogressive. With whom or with what body are we to identify this 'enlightened power'? Here we touch upon one of the greatest political and philosophical problems of our age, and it is probable that it was while he was engaged in the throes of speculative thought on precisely this topic, that Lord Acton the eminent historian evolved his well-known dictum; that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Lord Acton, it is evident, has generalised what he has noted to be a

consistent feature in the history of human activity. History admittedly bears testimony to the fact man has invariably been unable to possess power and be enlightened simultaneously; the two characteristics have never been discovered in an individual or a single body of individuals. Hence Plato's lament at the impossibility of his philosopher kings.....

The more we delve into the study of social reform, the more it is clear that it is not a question of so many economic or social or religious problems, which being solved would pave the way to utopia. Man is a clever animal; he is quite capable of evolving the machinery political or economic or social which is necessary for the transformation into the new democratic society. This is a great possibility, a certainty, if only we could be assured of the *desire* on the part of men to achieve a more equitable, a more just, a more democratic society. We may claim to possess the desire, we may pay devoted lip-service to the ideals of democracy, the will is strong, but again and again the flesh is weak. History substantiates this seeming truth; we say 'seeming truth' precisely because we feel that Lord Acton has acted hastily in generalising from history. History is not man; man makes history not history man. History, so far as we know it appears to substantiate Lord Acton's contention, but will it continue to do so in the future? We have no reason to believe that it will, for mental development like the evolutionary process is not to be measured or understood within the short span covered by history. We cannot now be aware of the mental possibilities of further enlightenment that man may achieve in the future. A time is quite conceivable when Lord Acton's

dictum will be an absolute fallacy. Even today the contention that power corrupts requires moderation, for it is possible to point out that power *tends* to corrupt, but whether it does in fact corrupt or not, depends on the specific case under inquiry. We may therefore conclude that though Lord Acton recognised a difficult psychological obstacle, his sweeping and dogmatic statement cannot be accepted without qualification.

Power centralised or decentralised denotes control, and control is an element that cannot absolutely be abolished in any society; even at its very minimum, control is present in the socialist democratic state. In spite therefore of Lord Acton's psychological difficulty, there is every reason to believe that men and women, when once imbued with a passionate desire to reform society, when once they have grasped the fact of the overwhelming necessity of transformation, they will not frustrate their own desires by allowing themselves to be corrupted by the power they obtain. The transformation of society, and the moulding of it into such forms as we may desire, is not an economic or social or religious or political task; it is supremely the task of the artist. The artist contrives to achieve beauty, balance, rhythm, harmony and proportion; those whom we have called the enlightened power, working upon the grander and infinitely more difficult canvas of humanity, are similarly motivated by the same ends. In the soul of the artist there is no individual selfishness; he is non-attached, disinterested. He is subject to one supreme attachment however, if it may be so called, and that is the attachment to the pursuit of meaning in beauty, even though in the process of this pur-

he the individual artist is compelled to submerge the personality of self. Such precisely is the social worker. The socialist statesman must also be the philosopher artist.

It is customary to lable Plato's philosopher kings as 'impossible'; and what is customary was in Plato's day probably not only customary but perfectly right. But is this any justification for continuing to regard philosopher kings as impossible? What is impossible under any specific set of conditions is not of necessity impossible under every other set of conditions that may be conceived. It will be noted that this problem is but another aspect of Lord Acton's dictum regarding power, about which we arrived at the conclusion that power does not always absolutely corrupt but tends to corrupt. By the same measure it may be contended that to be a king (by which term is understood any position of authority in the state) is to at once largely defeat one's philosophic aims. Power then tends to corrupt and tends to discourage philosophy. This in the light of the socialist's task is not a sanguine reflection, yet it would appear to suggest that given the initial desire, the new society is no impossible utopia but a practical plan of social renovation. The mere fact indeed of socialism which is the highest expression of human aspiration, is a symbol of hope, symbolic of inherent *desire* even in the midst of selfish acquisition and personal aggrandisement, for nobler ways of life, for greater justice, for happiness in a society in which freedom, equality and fraternity are not terms left to look after themselves but practical measures positively and actively sponsored.

We may then on the basis of the foregoing considerations postulate that the enlightened power

which will exercise the inevitable disciplinary control in the initial stages of a socialist democratic state, is to be identified with philosopher-statesmen conscious of their work in the manner of the artist who attempts to achieve cosmos from chaos, and inspired by the intense desire to better humanity's spiritual and material conditions.

To turn to a no less formidable problem: we are confronted with the query as to how, under the present dispensation, it is possible for socialist philosopher-statesmen to gain the necessary authoritative control of the affairs of state. To this aspect of our study we shall devote the following chapter.

SUMMARY

We have covered an extensive and important field in this chapter under review. Emphasis was laid on the nature of socialism, which we declared was not an alternative to democracy, but a *means* to a virile and vital democracy. An attempt was then made to indicate the relationship between socialist control and the concept of freedom, indicating as a conclusion that such control is not incompatible with an ultimate democratic liberty, and indeed is a condition of this liberty. Control, it was pointed out, must not be confused with repression. The Soviet Union was cited as illustrative of a state in which control may lead to an ultimate democracy.

The major purpose of socialist control is the establishment of an environment—a democratic environment, for as we have illustrated both the good and the bad both the desirable and the undesirable are nothing but the product of their environment. Nazi

Germany was cited here as an appropriate example. We proceeded then to consider what socialist-democratic conditions might be in economic, religious, political and educational spheres. These environmental conditions we argued, once firmly established, would work upon those subjected to the environment and mould them into patterns of democratic personality. Control we stated is required in the initial stages, but as a socialist democracy gradually but inevitably results control tends to 'wither away'.

An all too inadequate sketch was attempted to indicate the author's conception of the nature of full democratic living—a Christian democracy inspired by a creative culture. It was emphasised that in the developed socialist-democratic state 'culture' as a distinct intellectual commodity will not exist. We must like the Greeks be unconscious of our culture which would then be synonymous and therefore indistinguishable from the daily conduct of our lives.

We had earlier postulated that the imposition of socialist control would be the task of an enlightened power. This vague phrase had necessarily to be defined. Lord Acton's dictum that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, we reduced, we hope logically, to the milder form 'power tends to corrupt'. On the basis of this theory it was contended that philosopher-statesmen with whom we identify enlightened power are not impossible. The socialist statesman, we pointed out, is as much an artist as social worker; on the extensive and difficult canvas of humanity he contrives to seek that beauty and harmony which only the artist can visualise in the existing chaos.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE SOCIALIST'S TASKS

WE have spoken of the socialist's task as being essentially revolutionary, but this term being an extremely emotive description, is apt to cause one to conjure up visions of blood-stained guillotines and red-capped proletarians collecting aristocratic heads with all the facile ease of the denizens of Borneo. Even though one's vision may not be as specific as this, nevertheless the bias toward this visionary concept, is present in a larger or lesser degree in our minds. Our first task therefore is to dispel these visions evoked by uncontrolled emotions. A revolution is a revolt against the established order, but a revolt need not of necessity be identified with violence. Violence is to be decried for invariably it defeats its own ends, but the one socialist revolution which in taking recourse to violence succeeded in wresting power from the old order is the Soviet Union. In that country power has been used both to establish control and to suppress all anti-socialist elements. A certain measure of violence and ruthless control was necessary under the conditions prevailing in 1917; to declare therefore that a resort to violence always nullifies the socialist's ends is to ignore the fundamental fact that conditions vary from country to country, and that where violence is justified in a certain society it may merit the severest condem-

nation under a different set of conditions. All socialists of all countries have consequently to work out their own destinies according to whether or not the specific circumstances justify violence and strict socialist control. Socialising a country is often confused with Sovietising it; the one signifies broad principles common to all communities which have accepted socialism, while the other merely signifies methods peculiar to one pioneering country which has socialised itself before the rest of the civilised world had recognised the necessity of a socialist democracy.

If specific conditions allow of socialist control by means other than that of violence, then violence is definitely to be eschewed. It may be noted in this context as an illustrative fact that the more intellectually backward a peoples, the more violence is required. And it is encouraging to note that in most of the major countries of Europe the standard of general public intelligence is sufficiently high to make any choice of repressive force an immoral and impracticable resort to violence. Violence indeed though initially dedicated to socialist aims, may if utilised in an inappropriate environment lead to fascist control..... For violence begets violence and breeds the very seeds of reaction and insurrection; where however the standard of education is low as among peasants and other workers on land in the more backward countries, and where those who seize socialist control are genuine philosopher-statesmen, then a vigorous imposition of order and violent methods are perfectly justifiable, for it is only by such methods that it will be possible to establish and maintain the conditional environment of socialist-

democracy, and it is only among people who are yet 'raw' intellectually that environmental forces have the most promising field in which to function.

The implication of the foregoing remarks surely is that among the *nations with which we are principally concerned* Barthelemy de Ligt's dictum 'the more violence the less revolution' is especially applicable. Repressive violence in an endeavour to achieve socialist control is apt to be misconstrued by the majority of the intelligent and fairly well-educated public, causing suspicion, resentment and hatred. Further, the fact that they are intelligent and educated renders them, from their point of view, immune from the new socialist doctrine. Thus the effort to establish a new environment may not only be frustrated but will be rendered futile, for an environmental force however powerful cannot function against minds which have consciously set themselves against it. Further violence may then lead to wholesale slaughter in an attempt to kill off the older generations, so that new generations may develop freely in the new environment thus establishing the foundations of the new order. But this will be a long, painful and precarious process; violence is therefore to be strictly eschewed among societies which enjoy a comparatively high standard of living and education such as the English speaking countries and most of the major countries in Europe. We are quite aware of the fact that many eminent thinkers and moralists have denounced violence wholesale without exception, but we feel that nothing deserves absolute condemnation. Always there exists a certain set of conditions under which the generally condemned methods may be perfectly justifiable. Hitherto in cases where

violence has been used under circumstances in which a socialist success may have been achieved, the failure is particularly due to the inability or unwillingness on the part of the new holders of power to establish a new socialist environment. If the environment is promptly established as it is the duty of all socialist leaders to do, then the ill effects of an initial repressive control are immediately nullified.

But our concern here is primarily with those societies which have so thoroughly absorbed *Judaeo-Hellenic* tradition that a long and painful process of transformation effected by the imposition of strict socialist control is not only not necessary but definitely injurious to democratic interests. Some socialist control, as we have pointed out elsewhere, is unavoidable, but such a control need not necessarily be repression. It is only in the process of gaining this control that violence must be avoided, for the fact of violence would itself indicate that the public mind is yet incapable of adjusting itself to new concepts. Suspicion of the unfamiliar, warped minds, minds in blinkers, public inertia, lack of interest, lack of mental vigour—these are psychological obstacles which prevent the assimilation by the public of the progressive socialist programme and its essential significance. Cloying traditions of the old order maliciously linger to wreck the first experiments of socialism's advance force...The socialist revolutionary therefore, is confronted with a psychological obstacle in the form of an *attitude of mind* against which violence would be the worst conceivable weapon. A revolutionary's first task is to seize control by which subsequently the foundations of the new socialist democracy are laid; but such a control in the societies

with which we are concerned is both impossible and inadvisable without the general consent of the public. This consent must be received in the form not of passive acquiescence but of active and appreciative co-operation. The socialists' programme includes not a few transformations of startling magnitude, while generally the policy advocated is of radical reform. Human conservatism is so deep-rooted in society today that it is extreme folly to rush such a programme into immediate application when the unsuspecting public is unaware of the nature of what is being done for them. To precipitate matters and enforce socialist innovations when the temper of the crowd is not prepared to accept them, is to arouse certain opposition and nullify all hopes of arousing in the people a genuine spirit for co-operative socialist endeavour.

We are, it will be noted, confining our remarks solely to the national sphere for it is here that the first scenes of an incipient international revolt against the old order will be enacted. The whole structure of future international reconstruction is dependent upon what has been achieved in the national field, and a sound cultivation of the ground before resorting to action, is a policy which is a pre-condition of ultimate socialist-democratic success. The preliminary process signified by the term cultivation is precisely the socialist revolutionary's initial and basic task. So many necessary reforms have proved abortive because those who elected to carry them out failed to recognise the pre-condition of cultivating the mass mind. To the impatient revolutionary, this process undoubtedly is a long and painful procedure which, in the desire for practical action, he is apt to underrate. In the 'democratic'

liberal countries of which we speak, there is a considerable portion of the public whose aggregate influence when united and vigorously pressed never fails to affect the government. It is in this educated portion of the population that public power is vested, and it is from them that the socialist revolutionary must seek co-operative support. These considerations lead us back to the fundamental proposition today, that nothing in the national or international sphere may be effected without resorting to propaganda. Public recognition and support wholly or in part is imperative.

As far as we are aware socialists in common with all other revolutionary bodies, have either underrated or ignored the possibilities of a vigorously conducted propaganda. What literature has been produced by socialists have consisted of theoretical wranglings and disputes, indulged in presumably solely for the satisfaction of the author. Those individuals who have recognised the value of propaganda have conducted ill-organised, spasmodic one-man shows, leading to inevitable clashes among socialists themselves. The public has been showered with claims and counter-claims, with endless contradictions, with conflicting dogmatic statements, with vague plans which are both damned and lauded by different sections of the socialist camp.....Such chaotic methods have aroused suspicious hostility and at best simple indifference; hence the seeming lack of spirit, the lethargic indecision among the socialist ranks themselves.....Socialism is an old faith; its advocates have suffered many defeats and many have retired bitterly disillusioned, so that now its ranks are held by not a few who are weary and who wonder, in moments of gnawing doubt, whether

socialism is *the* true message.....Such unorganised, doubting, carping, hair-splitting half-hearted methods do not evoke that spirit of burning faith and piercing vision which alone can bind socialists of every brand and every country into one unified body vigorously championing a noble cause with all the passionate fervour that Vansittartic reactionaries instil into their hatred of the Nazis.....and Germans.

The spirit of pioneer socialists must be rekindled into a living faith, and those who are unable to regard socialism as anything but backing a dark horse, must sever their relations with the socialist body. This introspective spiritual reform is a necessary preliminary to the unity which we have postulated. But it is precisely in seeking means to this unity that unforeseen difficulties begin to appear. Is national socialist unity compatible with international socialist co-operation? How is it possible to arbitrate on matters affecting means to common ends? National conditions being so varied, is it practicable for socialists in different socialist groups to co-operate? Before these obstacles to unity are considered, let us recapitulate a few major reasons why organised unity is essential.

- (a) No cause or purpose can ever efficiently be served without united support. Religion is organised, political parties are organised, yet socialism a common creed of human aspiration throughout the world receives no such advocacy.
- (b) Organised unity instils into individual members a sense of united effort, evoking a spirit and a dynamic paralleled in our century only by the Russians.

European countries which profess democracy. The implication that democracy does not exist as yet is implicit in the absurdity of the common declaration that the present war is a struggle between the democracies and the Nazi-Fascist states. We are fighting not *for* democracy, but—we hope—*towards* democracy. Democracy is our supreme war aim, but do those men in whom the power of the Empire is vested give any indication of their realisation of the stupendous realities around them? As the foreign office conceives it, the war is yet another war of adjusting frontiers, of imposing war reparations and of burdening one specific country with the humiliation of absolute war guilt. By the very nature of their up-bringing, they are led to assume that their world is the best of all possible worlds and that those who are able to conceive nobler conditions of human life and are reckless enough to try and realise such conditions, are Bolshies, anti-God, revolutionaries, disturbing law and order and what-not..... They are as H. G. Wells has aptly pointed out equipped with mentalities nurtured under the dominant presence of governesses. Born into wealth and prominence, they inherit estates and possibly a baronetcy, then they proceed to gravitate towards the 'approved' universities, from which they emerge the nicest of nice young men, immaculate, handsome, good hands at tennis and distinguished fly-fishers. They then, according to traditional schedule, enter Parliament and given the wealth, position and influential wire-pulling they blossom into Under-Secretaries for Foreign Affairs. They are utterly incapable of understanding the outlook of the common masses whom they are supposed to represent and for whose welfare they are supposed to

govern. Their warped minds are thoroughly impervious to the implications of the present war of ideas, and of the overwhelming need of all civilised society to adjust itself to changing conditions and thus achieve the vital democracy for which we profess to be fighting. To speak such socialist jargon (as governess-moulded minds conceive it) is to evoke their incomprehensible amazement; they either regard it with the saga blankness of a country lout being spoken to in Malayan, or treat it as impracticable irrelevancies. *Their* realities it would seem are map realities conceived in terms of territory and national boundaries; *their* purpose is to load the defeated enemy with restrictive penalties and absolute moral guilt. In their solemn pronunciamientos to the gaping world, they would have us believe that they are conducting this war solely that they might establish those conditions of peace which they had been on the point of establishing when the barbaric Nazis had shattered their noble and inspiring intentions...They piously invoke God's assistance in this struggle against what is facilely termed 'the forces of evil' they are loud and insistent in their professions of peace, goodwill and liberty and democracy, and generally imply that the anti-Nazi states are realms of light compared with the satanic horrors of Nazi-Germany.

They are mostly unconscious of their power and privilege but with the coming of war and the consequent threat of a socialist revolution, all their conscious cunning has been generated by the fear of dispossession. They are determined tenaciously to cling to their power and privilege, to cling to their old order, and in this desire they have found willing collaborators and allies wherever wealth and position keep at bay the forces of

socialism...Fear and hostility to the new order are increasing and open opposition to rapidly lengthening socialist tentacles is becoming a familiar feature of the inherent social conflict. Being already equipped with the necessary power and position, they contrive through the press, news agencies, and distributing agencies to distort the view-point of the public, distracting it from its gradual but steady tendency to espouse the socialist cause. They fear dispossession as much, no more, than a Nazi-Fascist victory; as we have seen they even flirted with the thought that Hitler was their bulwark against Socialism, and despite the war the flirtation with Fascism may still be continuing.....Only the apathetic and supine indifference of the public have enabled them to seize power and position and effectively deny these privileges to those beneath them. Only a socialist union among the people forging and vigorously demanding a new order can hound these bigoted dullards from positions to which they have no right.

This flabby combination of army, wealth, court, church and position, when once acutely aware of the extinction for which they are destined, appear to unite into a conglomerate whole and determine to fight back with all the desperate determination of which they are capable. As Harold Laski has pointed out, no class voluntarily surrenders its power and position; it prefers to bare its teeth and fight till the bitter end. That is the situation as the socialist must regard it; he cannot possibly persuade the ruling classes to adapt themselves to the new conditions of which he is an advocate. They are incorrigibly beyond adaptation; their only fate and destiny now is to perish, and it is the task of the socialist to hasten their demise by cultivating the

mind of the intellectual core of the masses into an understanding receptivity of progressive and socialist ideas. The public must be made to realise that under the hypocritical assertion that they are fighting for the establishment of a world peace, the governing classes continue in the dear old fashioned manner to weave elaborate plans of war reparations, war guilt, of Foreign Office treaties and pacts and secret agreements and what-not.....In 1917 H. G. Wells collaborated with Northcliffe, Wickham Steed, from the celebrated Crewe House Ministry of Information, in preparing propaganda for distribution among the Germans. They had formulated a plan based on the League of Nations conception of a just peace in which Germany and the German peoples would participate. This plan was contained in a memorandum sent to the Foreign Office for its approval. Interpreting the ensuing silence as indicating approval, H. G. Wells and his colleagues pursued their propaganda activities which, if not in actual statement, explicitly indicated that nothing in the nature of Versailles would be imposed on the German peoples, and that the purpose of the Allied Nations was solely to ensure a stabilised and just peace in the post-war world in which Germans would freely participate.....The Foreign Office tactfully refrained from either dissociating itself from such a propaganda campaign or affording its sanction. Crewe House propaganda worked miraculously; German morale fell rapidly, and the war was over....Nothing in the nature of what H. G. Wells or any of his colleagues had conceived to be the final settlement followed. Politicians from the Foreign Office solemnly gathered around a table, closing the doors to a gaping and

helpless world, with all the profound airs of extreme competence calmly deliberating on matters of momentous significance. Is this cruel farce to be enacted again? No, we cry.

Yet, what is being done to prevent it? Is there any reason to assume that Foreign Office mentalities have miraculously developed during the last quarter of a century? A discursive scrutiny of the activities of Neville Chamberlain—a doddering old fool whom only an amiable indifferent English public would tolerate in a position of power—would immediately dispel such false optimism. Unfortunately when Mr. Chamberlain found the peace he so, so dearly wanted—even at Hitler's price—his compatriots carried on the good work in the same old dear fashion, like a hutchful of rabbits peacefully nibbling at cabbages... Chamberlain is not with us, but the thoughts, desires, and spirit that caused him to act as he did, when he cried with the pious enfeeblement of the aged 'Peace in our time' continue to constitute the guiding philosophy of the governing classes.

Inadaptable and unwilling even to compromise though socialism could never accept such petty concessions, it is the unavoidable task of socialism to dispose of them, to depose them from their petty little thrones of wealth and privilege and precious little intelligence or capability to concern themselves with affairs of world and state. The masses however do not suffer from the hard and fast mental framework in which governess-trained minds are moulded. They remain pliable and adaptable and the average of intelligence in the middle classes (i. e. between bourgeoisie proper and the labouring classes) is precisely

that undogmatic, and undeveloped indecision of mind which is most susceptible to socialist propaganda. It is a mind that wants something to bite, something which it can chew, something by which it can reorient itself and give expression to its unconscious desire for better things and better conditions. To this mind, the socialist must direct his appeal, and endeavour to cultivate into a receptacle of the ideas of the new order. Only when such moral and intellectual support has been evoked, can the socialist ever be in a position seriously to challenge the present supremacy of the governing classes.

Time is running short. It is impossible to predict when or under what circumstances the war will end. Even though the war is reduced to the long drawn-out struggle of popular imagination, the socialist has neither enough time nor opportunity to prepare for the new world, and to provide for the inevitable opposition of vested interests in positions of power and influence. The Labour Party, as we had occasion to point out in a previous chapter, has now developed into an integral part of the capitalist system; it symbolises compromise, it concerns itself with the welfare of the workers under the existing dispensation. It has neither the desire nor the ability nor the time to concern itself with the realities of the situation. The task of reconstruction on socialist democratic lines devolves solely on the shoulders of socialists who are politically non-attached, and who have no place in the existing order of things, and who are potentially the philosopher-statesmen of whom we have already spoken. Hence the urgent necessity of unity. Unity of socialists of all countries banded together as the United Nations dedicated to the one

any semblance of a steadfast unity in the face of such hostile opposition? There is every possibility of fascist capitalism being imposed on the post-war world. Perhaps we should expand on this bald statement. Let us consider the various countries engaged in this war, their policies (as far as this can be known to any intelligent outsider) and their respective attitudes and desires regarding the nature of the post-war settlement. Consider initially the disposition of the forces of socialism.

Assuming the absolute collapse of the Nazi-Fascists, and carrying this assumption to the most drastic conclusion, that a united socialist front has failed, we are confronted with a disheartening situation which almost deserves to be abandoned to its fate. Anglo-American domination in Western Europe will be counterbalanced by Soviet supremacy in the East. How far will these three major powers co-operate? And how far will their interests be diametrically opposed? To a certain extent the nature of the post-war settlement will be dictated by such conditions as prevail in Britain, whether British Socialist elements have succeeded in pressing forward the socialist case vigorously enough to minimise capitalist influence, or whether power-politics, armament kings, industrial capitalists, finance wizards, reign supreme as of yore... If however, there is an element of doubt as to the post-war situation in Britain, we may justifiably be certain that America will emerge from the war predominantly capitalist. Already not a few British industrialists have reconciled themselves to the inevitability of playing second fiddle to their cousins in the post-war world. This is not a recognition—

any characteristic Americanism; capitalists by the very fact of being capitalists are compelled to behave as such. And the hard-faced American big business chiefs who constitute America's 'ruling class' are vehemently anti-revolutionary.....British capitalism has already flirted with the possibility of stemming the tide of revolutionary socialism by invoking the assistance of American big business. United link-ups have in all probability been already forged, for 'interests' unlike socialists, realise the necessity of acting unitedly, swiftly, and thoroughly. Major E. G. R. Lloyd, British Conservative M. P., writing in the *Sunday Times* (London November 30th 1941) stated:

"Only a strong Britain and a strong America can maintain the peace of the world and keep down not only the danger of aggression but the smouldering fires of revolution which may yet see Europe aflame, and from which perhaps even our country may not remain immune."

Yet another section of British capitalism is engaged in drawing up plans with a view to counteracting the predominance of American commercial supremacy. And so on *ad infinitum*. If socialist forces exert themselves sufficiently, an Anglo-American capitalist collaboration will almost certainly be evolved, as a bulwark against revolution; but in the absence of such socialist activity, British and American capitalist elements will thereupon proceed to launch a joint exploitation campaign throughout the world.

It is important to bear in mind that unlike Britain, America is yet in the competitive and liberal era of

capitalist development. American Labour of which there is no one authoritative representative, even more than in Britain, has been developed into an integral part of the capitalist system; it is a fantastic error to identify Labour in *this* country with any socialist tendencies. American Labour has made its position unequivocally clear—that it conceives its function solely in terms of Trade Union rights and collective bargaining. In a word American Labour favours the principle of private enterprise, and has imbibed the capitalist philosophy of private profit. Such labour are either incapable of conceiving a reconstructive socialist economy, or are entirely indifferent. Be that as it may, the fact is dominant in our minds, that America is and will be the stronghold of post-war capitalism.

President Roosevelt is a *potential socialist democrat*, but he manages to hold his present position by virtue of his foreign policy. American big business Toryism is massive, solid and formidable; it is forthright and fundamentalist, and it is ready to bare its teeth and fight. Roosevelt's tentative attempts toward organising America's capitalist economy, in the form of the New Deal, though inspired by the socialist spirit, do not retain the substance of socialism. So flimsy is the New Deal, so much in the nature of a concession, that it easily invites the pointed accusation that it has been devised by Roosevelt solely to tide over the country during the slump. During the course of the present war the President has spoken in accents of liberal socialism and the pathetic *Atlantic Charter* (a sop thrown to idealistic socialists) betrays in every clause the fact of Roosevelt's authorship. The *Atlantic Charter* however is not a reality; neither are Roose-

velt's speeches realities. It is only in the post-war world that they may be realities. Will hard-faced American Toryism tolerate or concede or cajole?

No. It is not characteristic of American character to act thus; their policy is to fight to win, and to hit hard. That is the way they conduct their politics and, as we have ample evidence at the time of writing, the way they conduct their war. Their dominant ideal is thorough, ruthless efficiency. They are the people to beat the Nazis at their own game, and as the latest war developments indicate, American business is adept in competitive warfare. Even the most perfunctory consideration of these facts, inevitably suggests the conclusion that President Roosevelt's role as President is one which may be terminated before circumstances permit him to bring socialist influence to bear on the post-war settlement. His utmost *socialist sincerity*, evident in practically all his speeches, has won him an international ring of admirers who regard him as the only saviour who will bear the torch of sanity in the chaos of the war's aftermath. Such optimism is not justified, and can only be accounted for by sheer ignorance of the facts on the part of Roosevelt-worshippers. They need only summon the patience to study back numbers of magazines and old issues of American newspapers published during the campaigns for Presidential Election: There revealed in black and white is the savagery of the attack launched upon Roosevelt by the acquisitive and monopolising forces in the country.....The 'business' press adopted scandalous methods of attack which can only be denounced as base and vulgar, yet typical of American competitive politics. Is there in view of these factual considerations, the

remotest hope of America tacitly acquiescing to a socialist settlement in continental Europe?

Post-war America may see President Roosevelt still at the head of the government, but American business will conceive his function not so much as moulding a socialist peace, as warding off the restive American labour who by then may possibly have become more socialist conscious. It may be thought that we are giving vent to vague apprehensive fears which cannot materialise. We need only point out first that if capitalism does not emerge predominant in America as the country's representative attitude towards post-war settlement, it will be the socialists who are stunned with surprise, and secondly, that to substantiate our fears, we need only make a survey of American-Allied big business activities between 1919-1939.

Our opening fan-fare is an extract from Lloyd George's speech following the Treaty of Versailles:

"The truth is that we have got our way. We have got most of the things we set out to get..... The German navy has been handed over, and the German colonies have been given up. One of our chief trade competitors has been most seriously crippled, and our Allies are about to become her biggest creditors. That is no small achievement."

Consider these words with care. Are they such as would have been spoken by a philosopher-statesman? Or are they the accents of a politician representative of a government indistinguishable from monopoly capitalists and financiers? Do Mr. Lloyd George's words suggest satisfaction at having been party to a

peace treaty that was noble and just, or do they not smack of the smug satisfaction of a successful business dealer who has conducted a transaction solely with the view of reaping profits?

Mr. Lloyd George indeed had every reason to indulge in such self-congratulatory pats, for Germany had been *crippled*, presumably because she was 'one of our chief trade competitors'. German industry was deprived of three-fourths of its iron ore and one-third of its coal, and the country was burdened with reparations of a damnable nature. Germany has always fought for a place in the sun; in 1914 for colonies, today for what is euphemistically termed 'living space'. Superficially the German motive force was derived then from Prussianism, while today it is Nazism. But whatever the 'isms' which Germany has adopted, 'living space' i. e. possessions for purposes of exploitation have constituted her guiding objective.

This particular ailment from which Germany alone among major European countries suffers is a factor no more to be denounced than a disease, for such denunciation in the absence of any consideration of conditions which have given rise to the disease, merely serve to aggravate the situation. For reasons into which we need not enter here, Germany was the latest among major European countries to enter vast-scale capitalist industrialism. In the manner of patients who have caught the disease common to them all, Britain and Germany and France manifested capitalist symptoms at varying stages of development. The tragedy however lay in the fact that Britain emerged first in the industrial capitalist scene and developed with unprecedented rapidity, while Germany for

reasons which are immaterial, lagged behind. But the moment she commenced industrialisation, she forged ahead with all the fresh, unmitigated vigour of youth. Her natural energy and resources constituted a powerful capacity for exploitation yet by the time she had reached this stage of capitalist development, her means of exploitation had correspondingly shrunk. The world had already been subjected to jigsaw divisions and sub-divisions hallowed and sanctified by Foreign Office pronouncements regarding the rights of nations and the preservation of national frontiers. Germany, unable to expend her capitalist energy on exploitation, inevitably developed into a dangerous explosive force. She was in a state of intense suppression, thwarted and bitter, unable to blaze her way to capitalist prosperity except by a recourse to war. So long as capitalists reigned in power in the major European countries, including Germany, such a situation was bound to result each time with recurring intensity and tragic disaster. Such were the conditions that gave rise to the last Great War, and such the conditions that have nurtured the present war for the last quarter of a century.

During the period following the collapse of Germany in 1918 a socialist revolution, ill-organised and scattered though its forces were, could possibly have succeeded in counteracting capitalist influence. Wilson's Fourteen points remained so many points while Clemenceau, Lloyd George and politicians of the calibre of Poincaré busied themselves in evolving the treaty of Versailles, thus laying the very foundations of the war in which we are engulfed today. It is of the utmost importance to note in this context that on November 13th, 1918 Lansing, the United States Foreign

Secretary replied to a cable regarding the threat of famine in Germany. "The President has advised me to say that he is willing to consider favourably the delivery of food to Germany and to submit this matter to the Allied Governments on condition that Germany will prove that she will uphold law and order (i. e. suppress the revolutionary socialists)..." Consider this condition from the government of a country which supposedly is the most democratic and humane. Consider it, and reflect upon the fact that there are no indications of any attempt to counteract the recurrence of such political chicanery on the part of the capitalist governments during the coming post-war settlement.

Ironically enough, so soon as the shackles of the Versailles treaty were imposed on Germany, the British Governments endeavoured to make amends:

- (1) Because it feared that Germany, so cruelly pressed may be driven into the hands of the communists.
- (2) Because a weakened Germany meant a triumphant France in whom Britain saw a formidable rival.

France under the evil genius of Poincare was clearly seeking to establish a hegemony over all Europe. This merry farce reduced itself to a monstrous situation in which Britain sought to strengthen Germany because she feared Bolshevism on the one part and was suspicious of French ambitions on the other; in which France for reasons of security and profit repressed Germany by depriving her of the coal of Ruhr and the iron of Lorraine. This rigmarole of confusion was the pattern into which the pathetic Wilson's Fourteen points merged into obscurity.

Though the attitude of the British Government was preferable to the power-maddened insanity of the French repression of the Germans, it was an attitude that was radically identical to that of Poincare. Under the provisions of the Dawes Plan which assuaged the feelings of the amiable British public who wished to give Germany 'a square deal' Germany was inundated with foreign capital, ostensibly with the sole purpose of resuscitating the country's industries. That the advantages accruing to the creditors were excessive and manifold, apparently did not suggest that the Dawes Plan was nothing but *ad hoc* exploitation, less crude and more subtle than the French methods of militaristic repression. Profits from reviving German industries, additional reparations from such profits, and interest on the loan, certainly presented not an unpromising field for rapacious financiers and capitalists. In 1929 the inevitable slump occurred, with disastrous results in Germany especially. The stream of capital ceased abruptly, and when Germany had all but established herself on a sound industrial basis, the catastrophic collapse of her economic system revealed the flimsy, artificial foundations upon which her prosperity had been based. On the wave of despair Hitler subsequently rode to power and triumph.....He was an offensive pustule that emerged on the skin of imperialist capitalism.

Were *our* diplomats perturbed? Were they aware of the defects of the economic system which had caused the war and which now produced a maniac at the head of a nation united in hatred, bitterness and a sense of injustice? Appeasement began with Lloyd George:

"In a very short time, perhaps in a year or two, the conservative elements in this country will be looking to Germany as the bulwark against communism in Europe.....Do not let us be in a hurry to condemn Germany. We shall be welcoming Germany as our friend." (November 1934).

Germany had already developed into a potential time-bomb; already the three alternatives of appeasement, encirclement, and socialism were being clarified. Appeasement assumed an extremely remarkable form based on the assumption that Germany's feverish rearmament was solely due to the menace of Bolshevism. From this assumption was evolved that monstrous policy which achieved in the hands of Neville Chamberlain its tragic fruition, the policy of playing off Germany against the Soviet Union. How responsible government officials conducting the affairs of one of the principal nations of the world, could have conceived such a manifestly absurd political intrigue it is impossible to comprehend. It is evident however that Chamberlain and his flock regarded their smart manoeuvrings with complacent satisfaction, especially when the nation's armament kings and capitalists were enabled, by the nature of such a policy, to rearm Germany and enter into a commercial partnership with the aggressor.

Let it be noted that during this critical stage the Soviet Union had early recognised the desirability of a joint anti-Nazi front, and were preparing to consider an Anglo-Soviet alliance. Heavy industrialist interests with whom for all practical purposes the Government could be identified were incapable of entertaining for one moment a perfectly practicable plan of encircle-

ment compounded of nothing but hard common sense. The dreary story of the political intrigues, unworthy of any country that aspires to democracy, calculated with the puerile cunning of politicians in their dotage, aided and abetted by a class of capitalist industrialists and armament kings whose only passion in life is to indulge in the almost sensually degrading passion of grasping acquisition.....Such a story need not here be recapitulated. Government and interests repressed Germany, inculcated bitterness and hatred, then abruptly realising the bogey of Bolshevism, they appeased Hitler, helped to rearm Germany, and egged this maniac to attack the Soviet Union. Meanwhile our pious politicians paid eloquent lip-service to democracy, and one particular appeaser quavered 'Peace in our time'. The crass hypocrisy and idiocy of this farce are characteristics of the 1918-1939 power politics that rouse the socialist to cold, exasperating fury; they have left a smouldering resentment and a determined sense of intoleration among the thousands and millions who have for so long been condemned to an existence stripped of all those attributes of a virile life that contribute to happiness and personality. Will this fury, will this sense of injustice, suffice? Can socialism thrive on a basis of mere passion? Socialism admittedly is a passionate recognition of the noblest aspirations of humankind, but it is even more; it is a system of ideas without which the enthusiasm and passion are but so much steam, constituting a very pretty exhibition, but alien to the intellect which must be convinced.

But study in the calm light of intellectual inquiry, the fact that German military journals pu' in

pre-war days, contained advertisements inserted by Vickers-Armstrong giving particulars of armaments provided by that company. Place this fact in conjunction with the startling implications of the fact that under the conditions of the Versailles Treaty, Germany was forbidden to import any war materials whatsoever. Yet, Vickers-Armstrong and allied combines continued to supply Hitlerite Germany with arms, tanks and ammunitions, *with the consent of the Government*. 'That the sanction and approval of the government were granted to such armament activities, was explicitly stated by the Chairman Sir Herbert Lawrence during the annual share-holders' meeting in March 1934. In the same year was evolved the *Payments Agreement* into the technicalities of which we need not enter; we need however to ponder the fact that under the terms of this Agreement, Germany was provided with armaments to the value of one thousand million pounds. Six months before the outbreak of the war, and one day after the occupation of Prague (Thursday March 16th 1939) the Dusseldorf Agreement was signed between the Federation of British industries and their opposite German numbers—the most reactionary and dangerous elements in Germany—their sole purpose being to co-operate in world exploitation. These monopoly capitalists and industrialists who sought to sign agreements with their German counterparts are now spouting Vansittartic hymns of hate. Their sole war aim, they declare, is the annihilation of Hitlerite Nazism. Do they not realise the illogical nonsense of such an argument? Cannot they realise that the German capitalists with whom they sat in Dusseldorf and with whom they planned to exploit the world,

brought Hitler to power, co-operated with him, encouraged him, and armed him with the tanks and explosives which have plunged the world into indescribable misery? How is it possible to denounce Hitler and his Nazi gang, while ignoring the very men who made possible the emergence into power of this maniac?

Such then was the policy pursued by the capitalist governing classes and vested interests from 1918-1939, and such will be their policy in the post-war world, if the forces of socialism fail to respond to the desperate call to unity and action. Although the war is now in its fourth year, there is yet no indication of either a change of heart or of policy on the part of those who have branded humanity with the curse of war.....There is therefore no justification whatsoever for socialists to assume that in the post-war period, these very same monopoly capitalists and vested interests will deviate from the policy which they have pursued with evident financial advantage to themselves.

These are the capitalist forces which are scheming to stage a violent come-back on the European stage, aided by the massive weight of American big business which is capable of overriding the tempering effects of Roosevelt. What opposition will they confront? In the absence of any powerful socialist labour movement in Britain in co-operation with similar organisations throughout Europe linked with the Soviet Union, only the enigmatic Soviet Government with the sphinxy Stalin at its head remains as the stronghold of anti-capitalist socialism. What will Stalin's policy be in the post-war settlement? Here we enter the realm of pure conjecture, but we may initially base our consideration

on the realisation that there is no country more justified than the Soviet Union in maintaining an attitude of sphinxy simulation. She is *par excellence* the suspicious state. She alone among the great powers of the world had achieved a socialist economy; isolated in her splendid national venture she imbibed the spirit of hostility to the capitalist world around her. This attitude was a reciprocal one, and no effort has yet been made since June 22nd 1941 to abandon it in favour of a co-operative faith and trust based on sincerity and goodwill. Purple patches and eloquent references to 'our gallant Russian allies' have not one whit absolved the Allies from the obligation of clarifying their attitude toward the Soviet Union.

Six months prior to the outbreak of the war on March 10th 1939, Stalin in the course of a cold analysis of the situation stated.

"To what then are we to attribute the systematic concessions made by these states to the aggressors? It might be attributed for example, to the fear that revolution might break out if the non-aggressive states were to go to war and the war were to assume world-wide proportions. The bourgeois politicians know, of course, that the first imperialist war led to the victory of the revolution in one of the largest countries. They are afraid that a second imperialist world war may also lead to the victory of the revolution in one or several countries. But at present this is not the only or the chief reason. The chief reason is that the majority of the non-aggressive countries,

particularly England and France, have rejected the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to the aggressors, and have taken up a position of non-intervention, a position of 'neutrality'... The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work: not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling herself in a war with China, *or better still, with the Soviet Union*; not to hinder Germany, say from enmeshing herself in European affairs, from embroiling herself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; *to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another*; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear in the scene with fresh strength, to appear of course, 'in the interests of peace', and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents. (Italics ours).

What were the conditions which actuated Stalin to such extremities of cold calculating suspicion? That he was thoroughly justified in adopting such an attitude may be gathered from the story of Anglo-Soviet relations immediately preceding the outbreak of the war,—a story unparalleled and unprecedented in the annals of international statesmanship.

On March 15th 1939 the German army marched into Prague; on the same day Sir John Simon speaking in the House explicitly argued against collective security. On March 18th came Germany's ultimatum to Rumania.

Miraculously enough the British Government abruptly was aware of the fact that a Nazi attack on Rumania was imminent. On the same morning, the Soviet Government was contacted to sound the attitude of the Soviet Union. In response the Soviet Union suggested an immediate six power conference in Bukarest. Similar suggestions had been proffered by the Soviet Government previously through its ambassador Litvinov—once, after the German invasion of Austria and again during the Czechoslovak crisis in September 1938. These suggestions had been waved aside as 'premature'. The proposal advanced by the Soviet Union on March 18th 1939 however resulted in a response from the British Government to the effect that a conference was not advisable as events were moving rapidly. As a counter-proposal, a 'declaration' was suggested on the plea that this would be 'quicker'. Apart from the fact that the declaration which the British Government had in mind was a vague non-committal verbal maundering, it is astonishing that on March 27th no statement on the 'declaration' was made in the House—nine days after the Soviet suggestion for an immediate conference had been rejected on the plea that a declaration would be 'quicker'.

Here then is the background of Anglo-Soviet relationships prior to the outbreak of the war and to the further extension of the conflict to Russia on June 22nd 1941. On that historic day when Nazi troops crossed the border into Soviet territory, the British Government under Mr. Churchill had at length grasped the situation. All doubts and anxieties regarding Anglo-Soviet relations during the war as

affecting the conduct of the common campaign against the Nazi-Fascists, were set at rest by the Prime Minister's speech of alliance. Mr. Winston Churchill's speech has since then served as the basis of all Anglo-Russian pronouncements of mutual admiration and co-operative spirit, but the socialist world has not been favoured with any indication of a sincere desire, on the part of both governments to extend their co-operative effort to the immediate post-war period.

As we have seen the pre-war historic background of Anglo-Soviet relationships, thoroughly justifies the Soviet Government's attitude of reserved suspicion, and it is therefore incumbent on elements outside the Soviet Union that must in all sincerity contrive to obtain Russia's socialist co-operation in the post-war world. And that, as we have indicated, is the task of socialists.

The situation calls for an immediate unity of socialists throughout the world, an immediate and ceaseless struggle against the forces of monopoly capitalism. Socialists who deplore the so-called 'illiberalism' of Russian practices and on this score refuse to extend a co-operative hand toward their brothers in Moscow are being false to the spirit of socialism. The Soviet Union, as a pioneering country in the field of socialist national renovation admittedly committed not a few errors (it is easy to be wise after the event, especially outside Russia) that were detrimental to the socialist's purpose. But the circumstances in which the socialist revolution was born, and the obstacles with which it had to contend are factors which cannot be ignored. The primary fact which emerges from the welter of criticism that is

directed against the 'repressive' methods of the Soviet Government, is that when all is said and done, Russia is the stronghold of socialist forces, a stronghold with a sound and stable foundation. The capitalist governing elements in America and Britain will never extend their acquiescent co-operation; it remains for the socialists to recognise the Soviet Union for what it is—a country in which the socialist foundation of democracy has been laid. Furthermore, the phrase 'dictatorial repression' is one which cannot be applied to the Soviet Union; it is accurate to speak of centralised control which cannot be identified with repression. Witness the wonderful dynamic with which the people of the Soviet Union have risen to defend their homeland from the invader, witness the sacrifices and hardships they have undergone so that the socialist way of life may not be extinguished from the civilised world—then inquire whether repression can ever generate such spirit. This is no apology for the 'anti-God', 'illiberal' aspects of the Soviet administration; Russia requires no apology; least of all when such an apology is intended for carping idiots who are incapable of grasping the true significance of the socialist programme. The socialist who has all but come to regard his socialist creed as a religion (the orthodox religions have of course little significance for him) is best able to understand the strict, almost harsh methods adopted by the Russians in safeguarding the interests of socialist 'religion' which as we have previously pointed out is the highest expression of man's noblest aspirations. Religion is man's conception of the highest good, and in so far as it is that, we have no more right in condemning Soviet

treatment of anti-socialist elements within their borders, than we have in denouncing our recalcitrants (by shooting them) who by engaging themselves in anti-social activities jeopardise what we term *our Christian civilisation*.

A repetition of Versailles would immediately antagonise the Soviet Union, yet the urgent necessity for socialists in the English speaking 'democracies' to cease their quibbling antagonisms against the Soviet Union, and to consolidate a common anti-capitalist front with Russia preparatory to the crucial post-war period, is a necessity which is far from being recognised yet. Already the exigencies of war have brought the *peoples* of both countries (England and Russia) to a stage of mutual understanding and sympathy hitherto unparalleled in Anglo-Soviet relationships. The socialist's task is therefore threefold during the present emergency;

- (a) Consolidate this existing mutual understanding between the masses of both countries.
- (b) Establish sympathetic and sincere contact with Russian socialists, as well as with socialists within the occupied territories of Europe working underground preparing the stage for the socialist revolution.
- (c) Contrive to weaken by every means possible under prevalent national conditions ~~to weaken~~ the capitalist front, especially by gaining the moral and active support of the intelligent sections of the public.

The foregoing may be summarised in the statement that national and international socialist unity is an absolute desideratum. Only such a unity will be effective

in counteracting the forces of capitalist industrialists. Upon whom then will this socialist leadership devolve?

Clearly, circumstances have imposed this responsibility upon British socialist labour. It is a vast and formidable responsibility but it is one well within the capabilities of socialist elements in Britain, provided they recognise the urgent necessity of national and international unity. They will have ranged against them the combined forces to American and British capitalism supported by the massive reactionary elements of all those sovereign states which Hitler has overrun. Should socialist forces in Britain fail to assert themselves at the crucial moment, a European socialist revolution in Nazi-occupied territories would be rendered a futility. Both economically and materially, especially as regards food, Europe will be dependent on the United States, South America and the British Dominions, and capitalist big business elements are certainly not squeamish enough to refrain from holding up food supplies as a form of political pressure.

The factual reality of the situation must be faced. A socialist unity, vigorously championing the cause of socialism, inspired by a revived whirlwind of spirited effort, is imperative if history is not to repeat itself by emphasising the worst features of Versailles at the termination of the present war. Such a unity, as we have stressed above, presupposes an immediate reorientation of our attitude toward the Soviet Union. The fear has been expressed by not a few *socialists* that there is a distinction between Russian socialism and Stalinisation, and that in the event of a German collapse, a Stalinist dictatorship may be imposed upon post-war Europe... This is a fear which is ill-founded, for these socialists

who engage themselves in experiencing vague fears, would actively set about convincing Russia of the sincerity of British socialists in seeking the co-operative assistance of the Soviets, all possibilities of a Stalinisation would be nullified. All that the Soviet Union requires is a conviction that a genuine socialist revolutionary attempt is being organised, that Russia's assistance is necessary in this collaborative task; when once the situation is thus clarified, the Soviet Union will overnight be a dynamic socialist force actively participating in world socialist movements vigorously pressing the case against capitalism.....She will shed her sphinx reserve, abandon her attitude of suspicious independence, and realise that national socialist renovation within one's own border is never thoroughly possible in a hostile capitalist world.....She will realise that it is her manifest task to co-operate with socialist elements in every nation to bring about a socialist revolution throughout Europe and the world; and that national planning is incompatible with world chaos.

It may possibly be that not for many years to come, will socialists realise their dreams of a socialist democracy, that all the effort which they expend today in the service of their cause, may be rendered fruitless, but so long as a continuity of effort is maintained, so long as they steadfastly adhere to their supreme purpose of bettering the conditions of humanity, so long will it be certain that one day a virile democracy will be in full blossoming. The socialist is a realist in that he recognises the obstacles and difficulties with which he is confronted in the material world; he is an idealist in that he firmly believes in the ultimate decency of mankind, and in man's capacity to achieve the life of

democratic personality. The socialist too is an artist, an artist contriving to achieve a rare harmony and balance in the affairs of human life; upon the wide and extensive difficult canvas of human desires, emotions, conditions and aspirations, he creates a perfect reality that in its perfection it merges into the idealistic. In the chaotic world of today, he is the philosopher-statesman in embryo.....He and he alone achieves an objectivity which enables him to contemplate the tragedy-comedy of humanity struggling through the meshes of its own stupidity; he cultivates a broad and catholic outlook, transcending petty nationalisms and patriotisms viewing the drama of life with pitying sympathy for all who flounder, and an understanding affection for the wickedest of all. It is only the socialist who can regard Hitler with the amused contempt not untinged with a trace of sympathy that is characteristic of the artist.

And an artist's ideals are not easily realised.

